

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE COMMUNICATION PERFORMANCE
OF NATIVE AMERICAN AND ANGLO COLLEGE STUDENTS
IN THE SELECTION INTERVIEW

by

Gail Curtis Sloan
B.A., University of Houston, 1971
M.E., University of Houston, 1976

Submitted to the Department of
Communication Studies, and the
Faculty of the Graduate School of
the University of Kansas in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dissertation Committee:

Redacted Signature

Dr. Cal Downs, Professor in Charge

Redacted Signature

Dr. Nobleza Asuncion-Lande

Redacted Signature

Dr. Jon A. Blubaugh

Date Defended: JULY 12, 1988

ABSTRACT

This research focused on the communication behaviors of Native American subjects in the selection interview.

Specifically, this research explored three questions:

1) Do Native Americans differ from Anglo-Americans in communication behaviors related to the selection interview? 2) Do Anglo judges' ratings of Native American communication performance in the selection interview differ from their ratings of Anglo interviewees? 3) What relationships exist between knowledge of the selection interview, motivation to communicate, nonverbal and verbal behaviors relating to the selection interview, and the judges' ratings of the interviewee's performance. Where differences between Native American and Anglo interviewees existed, analyses were performed to explore possible differences between the communication behaviors of Native American subjects from primarily Indian communities and those from communities which were not.

Subjects were drawn from freshman and sophomore oral communication classes at Haskell Indian Junior College and the University of Kansas. All subjects were videotaped as they participated in a standardized simulated interview conducted by Anglo interviewers.

Personnel interviewers from the community viewed the videotapes and rated each subject on a an adapted version of Verandos and Harris's Interview Rating Scale.

The major conclusions drawn from the analysis of data produced by this study were: 1) The strongest correlate to interviewee success across groups was the use of specific statements to describe qualifications and abilities. 2) Except for a difference in subject use of pauses, termed latency of response, no significant differences between subject groups in the quantity of the observed nonverbal and verbal behaviors existed.

3) Judges perceived Anglo subjects to communicate more competently in the selection interview than did Native American subjects, though only one quantifiable difference in nonverbal and verbal content was detected.

4) Native American subjects from primarily Indian communities were perceived as displaying less intercultural communication adaption to the majority culture interview situation than either the Native American subjects from Anglo communities or Anglo subjects.

DEDICATION

To my husband Tom, who has and continues to support, challenge, and love me. To my daughter Lynnette and my son Keith, who endured months of "Just a minute, I'm almost through with this page." and whose patience with my research frequently outlasted my own.

To my friends Hannes, Sharon, Dora, and Suzanne, who shared their energy with me, consoled me, encouraged me, and never stopped believing in me. Their unconditional support made it possible to survive the untenable balance of employment, research, parenting, and farming. And finally, to Michelle, who taught me that my dissertation, like my life, was, above all else, mine alone.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Dr. Downs and the Communication Studies department faculty for providing a course of study which allows for the individual interests of its graduate students while providing excellent theoretical foundations in the communication studies areas. The department secretaries, Robin Holladay and Jeannie Torneden, deserve special recognition for their willingness to provide the vital communication links between the off campus graduate student and her department.

To Vern Carlsen - Dupont Corporation, Barbara Cowdin - Southwestern Bell, Lynn George - Kansas University, and Cheryl White - Kansas Job Service, for the many hours they spent reviewing and rating tapes and their ongoing willingness to help Haskell students.

Finally, I wish to thank the students at Haskell Indian Junior College, who have been my teachers as well as my students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of Study.....	5
Theoretical Orientation.....	6
Description of the Population.....	12
Research Questions.....	17
Operational Definitions.....	19
Overview of Research Design.....	24
Limitations of the Study.....	25
 CHAPTER II - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	28
Communication Competency Perspective.....	28
Intercultural Communication Competence Perspective.....	34
Selection Interview Perspective.....	40
Perspectives on Native American Communication.....	54
Conclusion.....	65
 CHAPTER III - RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	70
Subjects.....	70
Research Procedures.....	72
Interviewers.....	79
Judges.....	80
Measures.....	80
Methods of Analysis.....	113
Conclusion.....	118
 CHAPTER IV - RESEARCH RESULTS.....	120
Review of Research Questions.....	121
Results, Research Question 1.....	125
Results, Research Question 2.....	141
Results, Research Question 3.....	149
Conclusions.....	152
 CHAPTER V - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	157
Overview of Conclusions.....	159
Discussion of Conclusions.....	161
Limitations of Study.....	180
Implications for Future Research.....	183
Possible Applications of this Research.....	185
Summary of Conclusions.....	187
 APPENDICES	
Appendix A - Consent Form.....	189
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	190

INDEX OF FIGURES AND TABLES

Figure 1	Summary of Important Characteristics of Employability.....	43
Figure 2	Communication Variables Contributing to Success in the Selection Interview Used in this Research Study.....	67
Figure 3	Job Descriptions.....	76
Figure 4	Interview Format.....	78
Figure 5	Subject Information Sheet.....	82
Figure 6	Knowledge of Interview Communication Behavior Scale.....	85
Figure 7	Willingness to Communicate Scale.....	90
Figure 8	Self-perceived Communication Competence Scale.....	93
Figure 9	Interviewer Rating Scale.....	97
Figure 10	Nonverbal Coding Scales.....	103
Figure 11	Coding Instructions for Content Analysis..	107
Figure 12	Measures, Scoring, & Methods of Analysis..	119

INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1	Multivariate Analysis of Research Variables.....	124
Table 2	Analysis of KICB Scores.....	126
Table 3a	Analysis of WTC Scores.....	127
Table 3b	Identification of Groups which Differed on WTC Measure.....	127
Table 4	Analysis of SPCC Scores.....	129
Table 5	Analysis of Smiles Scores.....	131

Table 6	Analysis of Headnods Scores.....	132
Table 7	Analysis of Positive Gestures Scores.....	133
Table 8	Analysis of Distracting Gestures Scores...	134
Table 9	Analysis of Eye Contact Scores.....	134
Table 10a	Analysis of Latency of Response Scores...	136
Table 10b	Identification of Groups which Differed on Latency of Response Measure.....	137
Table 11	Analysis of Specific Statement Scores.....	139
Table 12	Analysis of General Statement Scores.....	140
Table 13	Analysis of Irrelevant Statement Scores...	140
Table 14a	Analysis of IRS Scores.....	143
Table 14b	Identification of Groups which Differed on IRS Scores.....	143
Table 15	Univariate F-tests, IRS Scores.....	145
Table 16	IRS Items on which No Significant Differences between Groups were Found.....	146
Table 17	IRS Items on which PIC Group Scored Significantly Lower than Anglo Group.....	147
Table 18	IRS Items on which NPIC & PIC Groups Scored Significantly Lower than Anglo Group.....	148
Table 19	Correlations of Variables with Interview Rating Score Variable.....	150

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The selection interview is a communication situation, (Downs, Smeyak, and Martin, 1980) which is an integral part of the employment process. The process of recruiting, screening, evaluating, accepting or rejecting applicants, almost always requires at least one interview (Webster, 1982). When used effectively, the selection interview is considered to be invaluable in determining, among other things, the applicant's fit with the company and employees, and whether or not the applicant is "the type of person who will fit well and wear well" (Moffatt, 1979).

In an employer's market, where applicant supply exceeds employer demand, the selection interview also represents a persuasive situation: a goal-oriented face-to-face interaction within a business setting in which applicants use suggestion or persuasion in order to reach the goal of employment (Raffler-Engel, 1983). In this communication situation, the ability to persuade becomes a necessary skill for most individuals, since most adults must support themselves through employment, and their ability to communicate in this situation may mean the difference between employment and unemployment.

While employment, and hence the selection interview, is readily recognized as a necessary and common element in the lives of most adult Americans, the majority of existing communication research on the selection interview focuses on the communication of Anglo applicants with Anglo interviewers. This approach tacitly treats the selection interview as an intracultural communication process, concentrating on the behaviors of majority culture interviewers and majority culture applicants (Galassi and Galassi, 1978; Arvey and Campion, 1982; Krieshok, 1983). While existing research should be recognized as necessary and valuable for Anglo-Americans and having some validity for other cultural groups, the lack of significant research on the interview as an intercultural situation fails to address the possible differences that may exist in such a situation. Until such research is done, professionals working with minority applicants seeking employment may be hampered by the lack of culturally based information for their clients.

The lack of research relating to Native Americans in the interview process represents a very specific problem for instructors working with this population. This group of people experience the highest unemployment rate in the nation: 38% on reservations, and up to 19% in non-reservation areas (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1980).

While geographical isolation and a lack of employment opportunities contribute heavily to this situation, the possibility exists that Native American applicants also suffer a cultural disadvantage in the employment interview process, which for most is an intercultural situation.

As an intercultural situation, the selection interview challenges Native American applicants to communicate effectively across cultures and persuade employers of their ability to perform. Because of the critically high level of unemployment for this population, the need exists to maximize Native American applicants' opportunities for employment through effective instruction in interview communication. Before this can be accomplished, descriptions of existing intercultural communication behaviors in the selection interview are needed.

Statement of the Problem

A lack of literature exists on the selection interview as an intercultural communication situation. The literature which does exist explores Hispanic or Black American interactions with Anglo-American interviewers (Mullins, 1978; Hopper, 1977; De La Zerda, 1978). Related research involving Native Americans, frequently labelled the "forgotten minority" by

sociologists, is almost nonexistent. Many accurate descriptions already exist of what majority culture selection interviewers expect of their applicants. The typical interviewer on most college campuses is traditionally an Anglo male between the ages of 20 and 35 who has a college degree (Jauquet and Parlin, 1977). If this description of interviewers generalizes to other employment situations, then most interviews, for Native Americans, are intercultural in nature. It would seem likely, however, that most interviewers are accustomed to intracultural interviews, given that the majority of the United States population is Anglo-American. Unless interviewers are well-versed in intercultural communication, the communication situation presented by the selection interview requires Native American applicants to persuade the interviewers to employ them, while recognizing and demonstrating the communication skills expected by majority culture interviewers in the selection interview.

Given the lack of attention that has been given to the Native American population in this area, there is a need for research which describes existing communication behaviors of Native Americans in the majority culture selection interview situation. This research should compare and contrast those behaviors manifested by Native American applicants and Anglo American applicants in

similar situations. In addition, research should consider Anglo interviewers' evaluations of these applicants. By providing such descriptions, researchers can contribute to the effectiveness of communication instructors who wish to develop effective training materials and methodologies for Native American applicants. Until this is accomplished, most instructors will be hampered by assumptions and generalizations about Native American communication behaviors in the selection interview.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is twofold. The first is to provide a description of the communication performance of Native American subjects in simulated selection interviews and to compare this performance to that of Anglo subjects in similar interviews. The second is to explore the relationships which may exist between this performance and judges' ratings of this performance.

Theoretical Orientation

This research study utilized the communication competency framework to explore communication behaviors within the selection interview. Because this study presents the selection interview as an intercultural situation, intercultural communication theories were also examined.

The Selection Interview as a Communication Situation

Many communication researchers define the selection interview as a communication situation in which the interviewer appraises applicant behaviors. This appraisal may result in a referral decision or a decision to reject the applicant from further consideration (Cohen and Etheredge, 1975; Downs, Smeyak, and Martin, 1980). Specifically, the selection interview is:

a specialized form of oral, face-to-face communication between people in an interpersonal relationship that is entered into for a specific task related purpose.... [This oral communication] allows visual, nonverbal messages to be a very important aspect of the interview. (Downs, Smeyak, and Martin, 1980, p.5)

As Downs, Smeyak, and Martin (1980) point out, there is no one basic selection interview. Prescreening interviews differ from in-depth interviews, and

interviews to select high level executives differ from those designed for selecting production workers. Regardless of the type of selection interview, however, certain characteristics remain constant. As Downs, Smeyak, and Martin (1980) suggest in their section on the "unique contributions of the interview," both the interviewer and the applicant in a selection interview have an agenda that may be accomplished better through the interview than through written materials. It allows the interviewer to assess the applicant's communication abilities, personality, thinking patterns, and levels of motivation, while allowing the applicant to get a better understanding of the company with which s/he is interviewing.

The belief that the selection interview is a persuasive situation which goes beyond the neutral exchange of information is supported by several researchers. Downs (1969) found that employers are influenced by their perceptions of the applicant as enthusiastic, motivated, aggressive, and confident, plus the applicant's ability to demonstrate his ability to "fit" with the company. These findings suggest that it is not sufficient to prove one's self capable of performing the tasks required for the position, but to convince the employer that one has an aggressive and confident personality as well. Raffler-Engel (1983)

states that the ability of the applicant to persuade is vital, and that the ability of applicant to "sell the product" is challenged by the control "the buyer", that is, the interviewer, has over the situation by setting the tone and initiating questions.

Since this persuasion involves both verbal and nonverbal communication, both must be considered in order to describe communication behaviors accurately within the interview. The ability of the applicant to persuade is a critical point, for while some interviewers represent employment fields where the demand is much greater than the supply, most represent situations where numerous applicants are competing for the same position. This research was based on the assumption that most applicants are required to compete for positions and are, therefore, responsible for persuading the interviewer that they are the applicant best suited for the position for which they are applying.

Communication Competence

One of the integral parts of interviewee communication performance in the selection interview is the individual's competence to perform. Over the past 25 years, communication theorists have offered a variety of definitions for the term "communication competence". Cognitive theorists, such as Chomsky (1965), equate

knowledge with competence, and behavior with performance. McCroskey (1982) supports a similar definition of competence which is based on knowledge of, separate from performance in, a given situation.

Argyris (1965) suggests that communication competence is composed of both knowledge and the ability to act on that knowledge. Several theorists have expanded this definition (Allen and Brown, 1976; Wiemann and Backlund, 1980) and suggest that communication competence involves knowledge, skills, and motivation. In addition to this, they support the perspective that competence is tied to the actual performance of the language in social situations.

For the purpose of this research study, communication competence in the selection interview is based on the work of theorists such as Allen and Brown (1976) and Wiemann and Backlund (1980) and is comprised on three major components: the subject's motivation, knowledge, and skill in communicating in a given social situation.

Intercultural Communication Perspective

A selection interview which involves a Native American and an Anglo participant represents an intercultural communication situation. A number of definitions for intercultural communication exist.

Samovar, Porter, and Jain (1981) suggest that intercultural communication occurs "whenever a message producer is a member of one culture and a message receiver is a member of another" (p.27). Asuncion-Lande (1981) suggests that there are two common denominators for intercultural communication: "the process nature of intercultural communication and the significance of cultural differences in communication." (p. 1). In her overview of intercultural communication, Asuncion-Lande states that the recognition of cultural differences and the potential effects of these on communication should make communicators aware that "...nothing in their communicative behavior should be taken for granted, and that accommodations should be made for such perceived difference." (p. 2).

Both Asuncion-Lande (1981) and Ruben (1983) suggest that intercultural communication should contain accommodations for differences. Ruben also points out that this accommodation usually:

involves some degree of stress and readjustment, as the individual strives to organize meaningfully with persons who reflect differing subcultural and cultural orientations. (p.142).

If communication competence, as defined earlier, is the subject's motivation, knowledge, and skill in communicating in a given social situation, then intercultural communication competence may be defined as the subject's motivation, knowledge, and skill in

communicating in a social situation with persons of differing subcultural and cultural orientations. This competency would then, according to the researchers cited above, require the communicator to recognize and adjust to, or accommodate, the differences that are encountered. The differences which may be encountered in an intercultural situation include differences in cultural perceptions, beliefs, and verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors (Samover and Porter, 1981). Each of these is explored in this research study.

In general, each of the authors cited above support the need for more intercultural communication research and the acknowledgment of participants that intercultural communication requires a willingness to make accommodations for cultural differences. According to Barnlund (1975), we no longer have the cushion of time and space to soften intercultural encounters in this country, and so we must find a way to prepare people to work "within a social system that may seem foreign, but no longer need(s) (to be) incomprehensible." (p.14). This research is intended to follow Barnlund's suggestions, by providing a description of the intercultural communication which takes place within the selection interview when the interviewer is an Anglo and the interviewee is a Native American. Hopefully, the

product of this research study can then be utilized to prepare Native Americans and Anglos to work within the type of social system Barnlund describes.

Description of the Population

The questions addressed by this research study were formulated to address both the question of communication differences between Native Americans and Anglos and the question of communication differences which may exist between Native Americans who have lived most of their lives in predominantly Indian communities and those who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities. This two-pronged approach grew out of the recognition that there is no "one" Native American population in the United States. The following description of the Native American college students used as subjects in this research exemplifies this situation and is included at this point to provide a rationale and explication of the research questions which follow.

This study, by recognizing the lack of "one" description to fit all populations, attempts to identify differences and similarities both within and across culturally diverse subject groups. Three subject groups were examined: 1) Native American college students who had lived in predominantly Indian communities, 2) Native Americans college students who had lived in predominantly

Anglo communities, and 3) Anglo college students. The decision to examine Native American students as two groups is based on the educational and employment assistance programs which currently exist to serve Native Americans. These programs serve one or more culturally-diverse populations: those comprised almost entirely of Native Americans who have lived and/or live in predominantly Indian communities; those who have lived and/or live in predominantly Anglo communities; and a mixture of these groups. By describing the communication behaviors of each of these groups in the selection interview, this researcher hopes to provide information which may be used to provide appropriate and viable interview training for Native American applicants which is based on the cultural experiences of the individual. An additional aim of these questions is to provide information to majority culture interviewers which will increase the knowledge of intercultural communication in the selection interview.

The Native American subjects who participated in this research were attending a small junior college located in Lawrence, Kansas, which has an exclusive Native American student population. The institution, originally named Haskell Institute, was established over a century ago as a training institution for members of

federally-recognized Indian tribes. Haskell, now named Haskell Indian Junior College, was accredited as a junior college in 1970.

The most recent (1981) social linguistic study conducted at Haskell (Yumitani, 1986) surveyed approximately 40% of the student population (N=477). These subjects reported memberships in 86 tribes, permanent residency in 30 different states, and knowledge of 40 different tribal languages. Seventy percent of these respondents had lived on reservations at some time in their lives and approximately half reported that they had lived among both Indians and non-Indians. Thirty-seven percent reported that they had lived mostly among Indians.

This population can be considered a microcosm of the Native American population on a national level. Many of the students came from families with income levels well below the poverty level. Frequently these students chose Haskell because it provided a low cost alternative to education offered by state and privately supported institutions. Some students from middle income homes also attended Haskell for this reason, while others chose Haskell because it was an "institution" in their family or tribe, with parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents having attended Haskell (unpublished new student survey, Haskell Indian Junior College, 1987).

These students, like the Native American population in the United States, also varied significantly in their academic backgrounds and in the degree to which they had interacted with majority (Anglo) culture. Approximately one third of the student population were academically prepared to achieve in college-level classes; the other two-thirds spent one or more semesters in remedial courses designed to help the student compensate for an inadequate or inconsistent secondary education (Geboe, Faculty Lecture, Fall 1987). Approximately 50% of the students planned to attend only two years and graduate with a vocational degree; the other 50% planned to transfer to universities after two years in the junior college setting (North Central Accreditation Committee Report, Haskell, 1984). Lack of student follow-up information prohibited knowledge of how many students actually enrolled at a four year institution after leaving Haskell.

Though a number of Haskell students had parents or grandparents who attended Haskell when it was an elementary or secondary educational institution, almost all Haskell students were first-generation college students. Culturally, these students varied as greatly as their tribal affiliations. Approximately 30% of Haskell students reported that they had lived much of their lives among Anglos (Yumitani, 1986). Haskell students who came

from states with low Indian populations may still have lived in predominantly Indian communities. Even students from high Indian population states, such as Oklahoma or California, may have had little tribal affiliation due to their non-reservation status which often has created a geographically scattered Native American population.

Thirty-seven percent of this student population had lived primarily among Indians. Their educational institutions were, in most cases, operated by the tribe or the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Boarding schools, attended only by Native American students who live in isolated areas, provided the only education some students had experienced prior to attending Haskell. In such situations it is not uncommon for an Indian child to begin attending a boarding school at the age of six, spending only holidays and summers at home. While at boarding school, they are supervised by Native American dormitory personnel in the mornings, evenings, and weekends, and attend classes on the boarding school campus with other Native American students. The only contact with Anglos most have while at school is when their classes are taught by Anglos.

As stated earlier, there is a need for effective interviewing skills for Native American applicants who choose to work within the Anglo culture. Because of the diversity of the population, research is needed which can

identify the communication behaviors of this population and which can provide a foundation for training materials which can be used effectively in a variety of educational situations. The following research questions are designed to provide information regarding the similarities and differences of communication behaviors of Native American and Anglo applicants as well as detecting communication differences which may exist between Native Americans from predominantly Native American communities and those from predominantly Anglo communities. The answers to these questions may dictate the need for modifying the focus of interviewee training, basing the objectives and the content on the cultural and/or educational situation from which the applicants come.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: Do Native Americans differ from Anglo-Americans in communication behaviors related to the selection interview? If so, do Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Indian communities differ in these communication behaviors from Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities?

Specifically:

- 1a Do these groups differ in their knowledge of acceptable communication in the selection interview?
- 1b Do these groups differ in their motivation to communicate?
- 1c Do these groups differ in their nonverbal communication in the selection interview?
- 1d Do these groups differ in the content of their responses in the selection interview?

Research Question 2: Do judges' ratings of Native American communication performance in the selection interview differ from their ratings of Anglos? If so, are Native American subjects who have lived inpredominantly Indian communities rated differently than those Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities?

Research Question 3: What relationships exist between: knowledge of the selection interview, motivation to communicate, nonverbal and verbal behaviors relating to the selection interview, and the judges' ratings of the interviewee's performance?

Operational Definitions

The following definitions were used to delineate the issues examined in the preceding research questions:

Majority culture selection interview (MCSI) is a structured employment interview designed to screen applicants for employment positions. In this study, the interview lasts approximately 12 minutes. Interviews were conducted by one of two Anglo-American graduate students completing degrees in communication studies at the University of Kansas. Both had received graduate-level training in interviewing techniques. Each of these interviewers had also completed graduate credit courses in organizational communication and were recommended by Dr. Cal Downs, organizational communication professor at the University of Kansas.

Native American subjects include subjects in this study who are enrolled at Haskell Indian Junior College and who declared an intention to complete a bachelor's degree after completing their first two years of study at Haskell. All students in Haskell must meet the Bureau of Indian Affairs' definition of "Indian" which requires the subject to provide written proof that s/he is at least one-quarter "Indian blood" and/or is enrolled in a

federally recognized tribe. The term "Native American" and "Indian" are used interchangeably by both Indians and non-Indians and were used accordingly in this research.

Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Indian communities (PIC) include subjects who attend Haskell and who answered "yes" to the question on the subject information form that asked: "Have you lived most of your life on a reservation (or in a predominantly Indian community) before coming to Haskell?"

Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities (NPIC) include subjects who attend Haskell and who answered "no" to the question on the subject information form that asked: "Have you lived most of your life on a reservation (or in a predominantly Indian community) before coming to Haskell?"

Anglo Subjects (ANGLO) include subjects who are enrolled at Kansas University and identify their race as "Anglo", "Caucasian", or "White", on the Subject Information Form. The use of the term "Anglo" in this study, rather than "White" or "Caucasian", reflects the terminology most commonly used by Native Americans to describe

members of the majority culture. These subjects also meet the academic criteria established in the methodology chapter of this proposal.

Knowledge of acceptable communication in the MCSI is determined by subject scores on the Knowledge of Interview Communication Behavior Scale (KICB), a 16 item written scale designed to measure subject knowledge of acceptable communication behaviors in the selection interview. This scale was created for use in this research after a search of existing literature failed to produce any established instruments designed to measure knowledge of acceptable interviewing communication behaviors. The scales for this instrument were created from materials in Downs, Smeyak, and Martin's (1980) test on interviewing. An alpha reliability of .71 was established for this instrument when it was piloted prior to this current research with a group of 30 Haskell Indian Junior College and 30 University of Kansas freshman and sophomore students. The students used in the pilot were not utilized as subjects in this research.

Motivation to communicate is determined by subject scores on two instruments: McCroskey and Baer's (1985) Willingness to Communicate Scale (WTC). The "stranger" subscale of the WTC scale was designed to operationalize

willingness to communicate. McCroskey and Baer (1980) report alpha reliabilities ranges for this subscale at .60 to .76. Subject scores on the "stranger" subscale of McCroskey and Baer's (1985) Self-perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC) were also used to define motivation to communicate. The SPCC scale was designed to measure subjects' perceptions of their own competence. McCroskey and Baer (1980) reported alpha reliabilities ranges for this subscale at .44 to .72.

Nonverbal communication in the selection interview is the percentage of time spent in eye contact, and the number of smiles, head nods, positive gestures, and distracting gestures. Latency of response was measured by timing the length of time between the end of the interviewer's question and the applicant's response. Each of these variables was operationalized according to methods outlined in Scherer and Ekman's (1982) Handbook of Methods in Nonverbal Behavior Research. An explanation of these methods is included in Chapter III.

Verbal content of subject responses refers to the content of subject responses which was coded as general, specific, or irrelevant verb clauses. This instrument is an adaptation of a coding schema designed by Downs, Johnson, and Barge (1986). Explanations of this method is included in Chapter III.

Coders refer to the two individuals who each coded 50% of the nonverbal and verbal content of subjects. Each of the coders have had graduate-level coursework in research and methodology and neither were enrolled or employed at Haskell or the University of Kansas when this research study was conducted.

Ratings of subject interviewing performance refers to the judge's scoring of the subject's interview performance on a modified form of Vernardo and Harris' (1973) Interviewer Rating Scale (IRS). This scale focuses on the applicant's verbal and nonverbal behavior in the selection interview. Speas (1978) reported a reliability of .82 when the IRS was used to evaluate the effects of interview training on a disadvantaged population.

Judges refers to the four personnel interviewers who each observed 25% of the subjects' videotaped interviews and rated subject performance using the IRS scale. The judges averaged 15 years interviewing and personnel experience with private businesses and public agencies.

Overview of Research Design

Methodological Framework

In order to provide a multi-faceted description of Native American communication behaviors in the selection interview, communication behaviors were examined through use of the communication competency framework. For the purpose of this study, communication competency was defined to include motivation to perform and knowledge of and skill in the performance of appropriate communication behavior in the selection interview. The instruments for gathering descriptive information about these elements are described above and in Chapter III.

Methods of Analysis

A variety of methods of analysis were used in this study. A between-group analysis of variance was used to measure and describe significant differences between Native American subjects from predominantly Indian communities (PIC), Native Americans from a predominantly Anglo communities (NPIC), and Anglo subjects (ANGLO). A

Pearson's Correlation was utilized to identify relationships between subjects' knowledge of interview communication behavior, motivation to communicate, verbal and nonverbal performance in the interview situation, and the judges' ratings of subject communication performance in the interview. A full description of analytical methods was included in Chapter III.

Limitations of the Study

There are several methodological limitations within this research. Due to the limited availability of subjects, the subject group size is small, with PIC and Anglo subject groups each containing 20 subjects, and the NPIC group containing 19. Because the Native American subjects self-reported the community type where they had lived most of their lives and because the answers to this question may have been be a subjective, there was a greater opportunity for variations within subject groups than might have been found in a field study conducted on an isolated reservation and/or in an urban environment.

Another limitation of this study is that it focused on the interviewee, rather than on an interviewer-interviewee relationship. This decision was made in order to keep the research within a manageable scope and to concentrate on a descriptive study of the Native

American subject groups. By limiting the scope of the study to the interviewee, the possibility of gaining more understanding of the interview as a dyadic intercultural communication situation was sacrificed.

Because subjects did not participate in the selection interview process as actual candidates for a "real" position, interviewee motivation may have been lower than what would exist in an actual employment interview. The sacrifice of authenticity for the interviewee was offset somewhat by the use of interviewers unfamiliar to the subjects and who were represented as professional interviewers. This design, while sacrificing a degree of authenticity, provided greater control than would have been possible in a field situation, making future replication of this study possible.

The videotaping of subjects may also have influenced subject and interviewer behavior in the interview. However, this limitation is offset by the consistent use of videotaping across all subject groups so that any influence of subject behavior because of the videotaping could be held fairly constant. The distraction which may have been caused by videotapings was counterbalanced by the ability to preserve videotaped interviews for later ratings by judges and to allow for greater constancy in the replication of this research.

Finally, while this research centered on Native American subjects and their communication behaviors, it must be remembered that in the U.S., "Native American culture" is comprised of over 200 living tribes in fifty states, and that the definition "Native American" applies to individuals on the basis of enrollment in a particular tribe, without regard to the person's participation with that tribe's culture.

Because of these limitations, the descriptive generalizations drawn from this research should not be interpreted as stereotypical of all tribal groups, but as additional information which might be utilized in work with Native Americans in the selection interview situation.

Chapter II reviews the literature relating to this research project.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following review of the literature relating to communication behaviors in the selection interview is organized into the following categories: an overview of communication competence perspectives, a review of selected intercultural communication perspectives, a review of the selection interview literature which focuses on interviewee communication behaviors in the selection process and interviewers' responses to these behaviors.

Communication Competence Perspectives

Communication competence is a term which has gained considerable attention from communication researchers in recent years. Wiemann and Backlund's (1980) article, "Current Theory and Research in Communicative Competence," provides a comprehensive overview of some of the issues involved in defining communicative competence. As they point out, communicative competence is a relatively new concept, presented in the 1950's and 1960's by Argyle (1965) and Argyris (1965) and others, which gained more widespread exposure through Hymes' (1971) work. Hymes defined communicative competence as

"the knowledge an individual has about the use of language in communication.....(it) is understood to be dependent on two things: (tacit) knowledge and (ability for) use" (Hymes, 1971 p. 16).

Refinements and extensions of definitions of communicative competence have continued through the 1970's and 1980's. Most of these definitions fall into one of two categories, definitions which grow from a cognitive perspective, such as Chomsky's (1965), and those with a behavioral perspective, such as Argyris' (1965).

Chomsky's (1965) cognitive perspective of communication competence concentrated on knowledge rather than behavior, which he classified as performance. Argyris (1965) defined competence as, "a living organism means, fitness or ability to carry on those transactions with the environment which result in its maintaining itself, growing, and flourishing" (p.59). For Argyris, knowledge is not sufficient. One must have the ability to act on the knowledge before being classified as "competent".

The debate over the nature of "competence" has continued over the last two decades. McCroskey (1982) sounds very similar to Chomsky when he insists that communication competence "is the ability of an individual to demonstrate knowledge of the appropriate communicative

behavior in a given situation" while communication skill "is the ability of an individual to perform appropriate communicative behavior in a given situation" (p.5).

Definitions similar to Arygris's include those of Allen and Brown (1976) and Wiemann and Backlund (1980). Allen and Brown (1976) state that, "Communication competence, unlike linguistic competence, involves awareness of the transactions that occur between people. Competence in this perspective is tied to actual performance of the language in social situations" (p.76). Wiemann and Backlund define communication competence in a similar manner, stating that communication competence may be defined, in part, as "the individual's ability and skill, which necessarily includes both knowledge of social/communicative rules and the wherewithal to perform in an appropriate manner" (p. 198).

While definitions of communication competence which encompass both knowledge and ability are more appropriate to the study of interviewee behavior than those which deal only with knowledge, a third category of definitions, which encompasses not only the cognitive and behavioral domains but also the affective component of competence, should be considered.

Rubin (1983) suggests that "communication competence is a social construct, not located within the individual" (p.1) which goes beyond the view of competence as inherent knowledge and competence as demonstrated knowledge. She defines communication competence as:

...an impression of one's own or another's communicative behavior. This impression is based on perceptions of behavioral skills (behaviors that have proved successful and are used successfully over time), judgments about motivation (inclination) to use these skills, inferences about the knowledge (understanding of communication principles) held about these skills, and how appropriate (which may or may not entail a perception of accuracy or effectiveness) the behavior appears within context. (p.2)

Spitzberg (1983) suggests that communicative competence involves knowledge, motivation, and skill. He terms this view "relational competence" and defines it as:

the extent to which objectives functionally related to communication are fulfilled through interaction appropriate to the interpersonal context.... This formulation is based on five constructs about competence; that it is contextual, referenced by appropriateness and effectiveness, judged

according to a continuum of effectiveness and appropriateness, functional (produces certain outcomes), and is an interpersonal impression. (p.323).

While Spitzberg and Rubin both utilize the concept of motivation within their definitions, the definitions differ somewhat. Rubin (1983) suggests that motivation must be defined in terms of both the receiver and the sender. Motivation, therefore, is the receiver's perception of the sender's inclination to use skills and must be present in the sender before s/he can be said to be communicating competently (p.2).

In summary, definitional problems exist in most discussions about communication competence. As G. Phillips (1983) so aptly states: "defining 'competence' is like trying to climb a greased pole. Every time you think you have it, it slips" (p. 23). Perotti and DeWine's (1987) review of communicative competence and communicative competence instruments presents three primary conclusions about communicative competence theories: (1) it is a characteristic of the communicator, (2) it appears to be related to role-taking in a social situation and (3) theorists do not agree "...as to whether competence is equivalent to a skill or to effectiveness or to a combination of both" (p. 274).

Perotti and DeWine's third conclusion is reflected in the following summary of this researcher's review. McCroskey (1982) recognizes the importance of the affective domain in behavioral effectiveness, but terms them part of communication performance rather than communication competence. Some researchers (Larson, Backlund, Redmond, and Barbour, 1978) discuss the "ability to act" as one of the criteria for competence but do not state concretely that one must "act" to be competent. Still other researchers (Rubin, 1983; Spitzberg, 1983) add the importance of motivation to the formula and define it as being part of the domain of both the sender and the receiver. Motivation, in terms on the sender, is equivalent to the sender's level of intensity. Motivation, for the receiver, is based on the receiver's perception of the sender's intensity.

While each of these definitions offers something of merit, a definition of communication competence which goes beyond knowledge and motivation to encompass performance is best suited to the study of the selection interview. Based on existing research about the selection interview process, knowledge of appropriate communication behavior and motivation to communicate appear to be necessary, but not sufficient, components of competence in the interview. For the purpose of this study, communication competence will follow the

definitions of Spitzberg (1983), Rubin (1983), and others who consider performance of the communication skills to be the essence of communication competence.

Intercultural Communication Competence Perspectives

Thus far, the discussion of communication competence has been generic; the following synopsis of communication competence concentrates on the application of communication competence perspectives to intercultural communication theories and perspectives. The use of the term "perspectives" is paramount to this synopsis given the limited current level of theory development in the intercultural field.

Gudykunst (1983), in "Theorizing: An Introduction" suggests that intercultural communication is in a paradigmatic stage of development with scholars debating the possibility and/or the desirability of theory development in the intercultural area. He goes on to suggest "that some form of theorizing" is necessary in intercultural communication in order to facilitate the understanding of the communication process in intercultural situations and to guide future research efforts (p.15). He warns, however, "that our initial attempts at theorizing will be rough and will require much refinement." (p.15).

An excellent example of the current state of intercultural communication theory development is included in Intercultural Communication Theory, Current Perspectives, Volume VII of the International and Intercultural Communication Annual which was edited by Gudykunst (1983). This volume is an attempt to classify and examine current intercultural theories and perspectives, many of which had been presented at an intercultural communication action caucus and seminar held at the 1980 Speech Communication Association convention. Eight theoretical areas of concern for intercultural communication scholars were identified in this caucus. These included code and code systems; constructivism; mathematical modeling; rhetorical theory; rules theory, systems theory, relationship development; and alternative approaches. While each of these areas are respected areas of theory development in the field of communication in general, Ellingworth's (1983) theory of adaptive intercultural communication seems particularly compatible with the purpose of this study: to describe communication behaviors in the intercultural selection interview and to attempt to describe the relationship between specific interviewee communication behaviors and judge's ratings of interviewee's communication performance.

Ellingworth (1983) presents a theory of intercultural communication which is based, not on research-derived theory, which he suggests is not yet possible, but on a "rational generation" that may be subject to empirical research (p.195). This theory, which Ellingworth terms "adaptive intercultural communication", seems particularly applicable to this research study's emphasis on intercultural communication competence in the selection interview situation.

Ellingworth's summary of this theory, which he presents as a "rationally derived, task-oriented dyadic theory" (p. 203), follows:

Intercultural communication is viewed as "occurring under conditions often characterized by disparity of purpose, inequality in status and power, and advantage related to setting. Mutual adaptation of communication style is proposed as the necessary condition for intercultural communication to occur and continue. When equity is not present, the burden of adaptation is predicted to shift toward the less advantaged. When equity is present, the adaptive behavior will be shared. (p.203)

As established earlier, in an employer's market, the responsibility for persuasion falls on the interviewee. As such, according to Ellingworth's definition of adaptive intercultural communication, the burden of

adaptation shifts to the applicant. The applicant's success in adapting to this situation may then be considered a measure of communication competence in the interview situation.

Other intercultural scholars suggest somewhat different perspectives on intercultural communication competence, but most seem to share two assumptions: (1) effective intercultural communication occurs when there is shared understanding, and (2) this shared understanding is based on one or both parties adapting to the communication situation in which they are participants. This is reflected in Barnlund's (1975) implication that communicative success (competence) can be equated with interpersonal understanding. According to Barnlund, this understanding is dependent on three factors: perceptual orientations, systems of belief, and communicative styles. If one also accepts his premise that there is an underlying narcissistic bias in human society that causes individuals to seek reflections of themselves in others, then an assumption may be made that in a particular communication situation, such as the selection interview, the applicant judged to be most competent will be the one most like the interviewer in orientation, beliefs, and communicative style. If an applicant does not already share these orientations, beliefs, and communication styles, then the assumption

may be made that the most successful applicant will be the one who can adapt his or her behaviors to those of the interviewer.

Barnlund (1975) also stresses the necessity of the understanding of communication codes to achieve intercultural communication. This understanding requires the knowledge and recognition of the unique properties of the codes which are being used, motivation to apply these codes, and an ability to bring these codes into alignment. Hence, Barnlund's definition of intercultural communication competence, like Spitzberg's definition of communication competence, requires knowledge, skill, and motivation to communicate in a given situation. When one considers the selection interview in this context, it is clear that the Native American applicant must have the knowledge, skill, and motivation to perform, not only according to the dictates of the selection interview criteria, but also to perform in keeping with the cultural expectations of the Anglo interviewer, who expects the interviewee to be enthusiastic, confident, motivated, and aggressive. The success of this performance may very well depend on the applicant's ability to adapt his or her behaviors to these norms.

Samover and Porter (1985) reiterate Barnlund's guidelines for successful intercultural communication by suggesting barriers to effective intercultural

communication can be decreased when one has knowledge and understanding of the cultural factors that can vary and is sincere in his or her ability to communicate across cultural boundaries. Knowledge of appropriate communication behavior may be difficult to obtain if Forsdale (1981) is correct in his assumption that learning to shift communication behaviors according to situations is an unconscious activity for many individuals. According to Forsdale, this unconscious shifting occurs most often when persons are introduced to situations requiring this shift at an early age. For Native American applicants raised in a predominantly Indian community, this shift may not have been necessary and hence, does not occur naturally when it later may be required in an intercultural situation such as the selection interview. For Anglo subjects interviewing with Anglo interviewers, the required shift may be less difficult since the communication is usually intracultural, rather than intercultural, in nature.

Whether one is investigating competent intercultural communication or competent communication in the interview situation, motivation, knowledge and ability must be considered. The purpose of this review is not to promote one best definition of intercultural communication competence, but to provide a context for the examination of communication behaviors in an interview situation. By

utilizing Spitzberg's (1983) and Rubin's (1983) definitions of communicative competence as involving knowledge, motivation, and skill, and Ellingsworth's (1983) definition of adaptive intercultural communication, this study attempted to provide a description of communication behavior in the selection interview which encompasses knowledge of communication behavior in the selection interview, motivation to communicate, and skill in communicating in the interview situation. Chapter III describes the methodology which will be utilized to provide such a description.

Selection Interview Perspective

An applicant's communicative performance is frequently listed by employers as the most important factor in their hiring decisions (Downs, 1969; Tschirgi, 1972-73; Cohen and Etheredge, 1975; Drake et. al., 1972; Hollandsworth, et.al., 1979; Posner, 1981). This does not imply that interviewee communication performance is the exclusive basis for employment decisions. Factors such as work experience, educational preparation, reference checks, and selection testing may precede the interview (Robertson, J., 1978). Because applicants are

rejected or accepted for an interview based on these factors, the interview then becomes the 'acid test' for accepting or rejecting the interviewee.

This section of the literature review concentrates on the interviewee's communication performance and judgements made about that performance by personnel interviewers. This does not imply that the interviewer's involvement in the interview should be ignored. However, as Jablin and McComb (1983) point out, in their review of communication-related articles on the selection interview, 70% of the articles address the interviewer's behavior and 17% address the interviewee's. This disparity suggests a need for more knowledge about interviewee communication behavior. The following paragraphs consider existing research reviews which focus on the applicant's communication performance in the selection interview and interviewers and personnel judges responses to this performance, followed by an in-depth presentation of research which exemplifies much of the existing research on interviewee communication performance in the selection interview.

Goodall and Goodall (1982), in their article, "The Employment Interview: a Selective Review of the Literature with Implications for Communications Research," summarized the result of five research studies which had focused on interviewee communication

characteristics associated with favorable hiring decisions. A summary of these findings can be found in Figure 1.

Figure 1
Summary of Important Characteristics of Employability

Downs (1969)	Cohen & Etheredge (1975)	Drake, et. al (1977)	Hollandsworth (1979)	Posner (1981)
enthusiasm and motivation	verbal and nonver- bal mannerisms	ambition and motivation	appropriateness content in answers	future potential
oral communication	general appearance communicate	ability to	fluency of speech ability	communications
emotional stability	personal motives	'good' personality	composure	maturity
aggressiveness and initiative	*****	'fit' with company and goals	body posture	*****
confidence	***** intelligence	creativity and	eye contact	*****

Galassi and Galassi (1978), in their article "Preparing Individuals for Job Interviews: Suggestions from More Than 60 Years of Research," state that "image management" is a necessary part of any effective interviewee training program. They define image management as:

...presenting yourself honestly but in such a way that the interviewer does not develop a negative impression based on subjective factors that are unrelated to job performance (p.189)

Appropriate eye contact, smiling, head movement, attentive posture, small interpersonal distance, and direct body orientation were listed by Galassi and Galassi (1978) as methods by which image management could be facilitated. They also suggest that interviewees need to discuss special qualifications of the position for which they are interviewing early in the interview and periodically during the interview process.

In his review of research trends in the selection interview, Kreishok (1983) indicated that nonverbal behaviors which included eye contact (Amalfintano and Kalt, 1977, Young & Beier, 1977), smiling behavior, and head movements (Young & Beier, 1977) led to the greatest number of "hire" decisions. Amalfitano and Kalt's (1977) research used photographs of two 'applicants', in two eye positions, either looking straight into the camera

or looking downward. Forty-four job interviewers were randomly assigned to rate one of the two 'applicants', based only on the photograph, for a position as a management trainee. The 'applicant' who was looking straight ahead in the photograph was rated as significantly more alert, assertive, dependable, confident, responsible and having more initiative than the same 'applicant' who was looking down.

Imada and Hakel (1977) researched the effect of nonverbal immediacy on simulated employment interview outcomes. The researchers used Mehrabian's definition of immediacy, defining it as "an interaction between two individuals involving greater physical proximity and/or greater perceptual availability of two persons" (p.295). Immediacy was manipulated by increasing eye contact, smiling, and the use of gestures and using attentive posture, smaller interpersonal distance, and a direct body orientation in the high immediacy situations and using no eye contact or smiling, a slouched posture, greater interpersonal distance, and an indirect body orientation in the nonimmediate condition. The "applicant" used identical scripts in both the immediate and nonimmediate condition interviews.

University students who were used as raters in this study found the immediate interviewee to be significantly warmer and more enthusiastic than the nonimmediate

interviewee and rated the immediate interviewee as more likely to be accepted, more successful, more qualified, better liked, and more competent than the nonimmediate interviewee. The same study, which used subjects as either observers or interviewers, found that the interviewer subjects were very comfortable and satisfied when they interacted with the nonverbally immediate applicant and were uncomfortable and dissatisfied when they interacted with the nonimmediate applicant. Subject observers, however, did not differ significantly on their comfort or satisfaction levels when watching the interviewee interact with the subject.

Hollandsworth, Kazelskis, Stevens, and Dressel (1979) also researched the effects of nonverbal communication on employment decisions in the selection interview. Their work, which compared the importance of verbal, articulative, and nonverbal communication on these decisions, utilized 73 on-campus recruiters' ratings of 338 on-campus interviews. These interviews reflected a wide range of occupational categories and recruiter characteristics. Recruiters evaluated interviewees on a behaviorally anchored rating scale with interviewers rating how descriptive an ideal behavior was to the candidate's actual interview behavior. Their results indicated that the appropriateness of content of the applicant's communication was the single most

important variable, and the fluency of speech and composure ranked second and third, respectively. Eye contact, body posture, loudness of voice, and personal appearance also contributed to hiring decisions, but were a much weaker influence.

Rasmussen (1984) researched the effect of nonverbal behavior, verbal behavior and resume credentials on selection interview behaviors. These variables were co-manipulated in simulated videotaped interviews. Eye contact was held at either 100% or 0%; smiling occurred either 16% to 23% of the time or not at all; and hand gesturing and head nodding were either frequent or nonexistent. Resumes were either of high quality, with excellent academic achievement and highly relevant employment; or low quality, with low academic achievement and little relevant work experience. Good and poor quality scripts were developed following similar guidelines. Eighty university students rated the 'applicant' for a hypothetical position as a personnel trainee. Rasmussen's results indicated that resume credentials had the most impact on selection decisions and that high levels of nonverbal behavior had a more positive effect than did low levels only when the verbal content was good. He summarized his findings as follows:

"in situations where resume and verbal information vary widely among applicants, nonverbal behavior alone has a relatively small effect" (p.551).

McGovern's and Tinsley's research (1978) utilized four videotaped job interviews with identical verbal content and different nonverbal behavior which were shown to 52 personnel representatives. Their results showed 23 of the 26 interviewers who saw the high nonverbal candidate tapes stated they would have the high nonverbal candidate back for a second interview. All 26 of the interviewers who saw the low nonverbal candidate rejected him for a second interview.

A consideration of the effects of language style on selection interview outcome has also been considered in the literature. Jablin and McComb (1983) reported three studies relating to language styles of interviewees and interviewer decisions. These studies include Hopper's (1977) work exploring the effects of 'standard' and 'nonstandard' dialects and applicants' race. His results suggested that black applicants who spoke 'standard' dialect were favored by interviewers over other candidates, and that the interviewees' ethnicity was not important if language styles were similar.

De La Zerda and Hopper's (1978) study with Mexican Americans with varying degrees of accentedness found that applicant's speech accentedness did affect hiring

decisions. The more standard sounding the applicant, the more likely he was to be hired for supervisory positions, but the less likely he was to be hired for semi-skilled positions. Byrd (1980) manipulated the vocal activity of black and white male interviewees. They found that vocal activity was more powerful than applicant race in predicting interviewer's selections, that black applicants were favored over white applicants, and that high vocal activity was perceived as more desirable than low vocal activity.

Kalin's and Rayko's research (1978) found similar results. They used audiotapes of applicants with English-Canadian accents and applicants with definite foreign accents such as Italian, Greek, and Portuguese to measure interview judgements. Student raters choose the applicants with foreign accents for lower status jobs and applicants with English-Canadian accents for higher status jobs.

Krieschok (1983) summed up his review of research on race and speech characteristics in the interview in the following manner: "while little direct prejudice against any particular race was identified, the research does imply that the less "White" the applicant is, by virtue of speech, mannerisms, etc., the greater the discrimination is evident" (p.12).

Goodall and Goodall (1982) in addition to summarizing the research listed above, critiqued many of the studies they had reviewed as implying that the "...attractive candidate who speaks well, maintains eye contact, and smiles may have the competitive edge over candidates who are more qualified for the position." (p.120).

In summary, existing research on the selection interview suggests that a wide variety of communication behaviors affect an interviewer's decisions. Research results on the importance on interviewee nonverbal and verbal behaviors in the selection interview vary. It would appear that some of the existing research which supports the importance of nonverbal behavior in the interview draws this conclusion without considering where the content of the communication fits into the formula for successful interviewing (McGovern and Tinsley, 1978; Imada and Hakel, 1977). By holding the level of communication content static, they eliminate the possibility of examining the degree to which it may influence interview outcomes.

Other research, such as Rasmussen's (1984) and Hollandsworth, Kazelskis, Stevens, and Dressel (1979) provides a more complete view of the variables which influence interview outcomes by considering both content and nonverbal communication in their research.

Rasmussen's laboratory study allowed him to control for verbal content and nonverbal behavior by using trained 'applicants' and structured scripts. A weakness of his study, however, was the lack of a continuum in these behaviors. Eye contact was either constant or nonexistent; scripts were either very strong or very weak. Because of these inherent weaknesses, his results, which indicate that resume credentials had the most impact on selection decisions, should be viewed with caution.

Hollandsworth, Kazelskis, Stevens, and Dressel (1979) field research considered the impact of appropriateness of content as well as nonverbal behaviors. By using campus interviewers as raters of interviewee behaviors as well as judges of the actual performance of the same applicants, the researchers were able to examine the effect of both verbal and nonverbal variables. The same field situation which allowed for the examination of these variables also created an inherent weakness, in that the person who interviewed the applicants and made the decision regarding whether or not the applicant would be considered for employment was also the person who was asked to subjectively rate which variables he had used to make this decision. The goal of this current research was to overcome some of the

obstacles presented by early research methodologies while attempting to build on the body of information they provided about interviewing behavior.

This research study did not attempt to examine the influence of the interviewer on applicant behavior. A vast body of literature already exists which examines the unique interactions which may exist between interviewer and interviewee and the ramifications of such interactions. However, several comments about interviewer-interviewee relationships are included at this point to suggest areas of consideration which may have influenced this study's findings and may be of use in the creation of related research.

Interviewers are influenced by a "like me" effect', defined by Raffler-Engel (1983) as "wanting a person with tastes and characteristics similar to themselves" (p.62). This effect, termed "similar to me" by Rand and Wexley (1975) plays a major part in applicant evaluation, with interviewers generally giving better ratings to applicants who are similar to themselves. As mentioned earlier in the intercultural communication research review, individuals have a tendency to be most comfortable with behaviors that fit their own cultural norms. This same tendency is observable in interviewer-interviewee communications. When the interviewer is an Anglo-American with a college education, the Native

American interviewee whose culture may have included little interpersonal contact with persons of this background, may have greater difficulty in establishing the "like me" effect. According to Raffler-Engel (1983) personnel interviewers do not require absolute conformity in interviewees they select as employees, but they feel "a certain amount is essential".(p.130).

Given the weight interviewers seem to place on similarities between themselves and applicants and the general tendency of employers to seek enthusiastic, aggressive applicants who display confidence and assertiveness, one may speculate that applicants who display communication behaviors that do not reflect these values may fare less well than those who do. This research study grows out of the need to examine this possibility, utilizing a descriptive research methodology which describes intercultural communication behaviors of the Native American interviewee in the selection interview. These results can then be viewed in light of current majority culture expectations on the part of the interviewer.

Due to the limitations of time and space for this particular research, the communication behaviors of the interviewee, and the relationship of these behaviors to favorable hiring decisions will be the focus of this study. Variables which are reflected in communication

competency and intercultural perspectives, such as knowledge, motivation, and ability, were explored in this research. Other variables, such as nonverbal behaviors and content of responses, which reflect the results of research on interviewee competence in the interview, were also be considered. The following section of this chapter interposes these variables on current research on Native American communication behaviors.

Perspectives on Native American Communication

The following literature review emphasizes research which has occurred in the last two decades on communication behaviors of Native Americans. While this information, with the exception of one article, is not focused on the selection interview situation, it does offer a perspective on the communication behaviors of this group and illustrates some of the sociolinguistic differences which exist between Native American and Anglo cultures. These illustrations and references, which are contrasted with the "ideal applicant" of the Majority Culture Selection Interview (MCSI), exemplify some of the problems faced by many Native Americans in the interview situation.

Communication competency in the MCSI, as mentioned earlier, is judged in part by the applicant's ability to communicate enthusiasm, aggressiveness, and confidence through both verbal and nonverbal communication. The "ideal" applicant, by Anglo standards, may convey these through a wide range of oral communication, including raising the volume of voice, changing to a more energetic tone of voice, and/or increasing his rate of speech.

In many Indian tribes, a quiet voice is considered a sign of self-control and self-confidence. S. Phillips, in an extensive sociolinguistic study (1983) of the Warm Springs Indian Tribe in Washington, describes such vocal behavior.

...voice loudness is generally not as great in Indian interactions (in contrast with Anglos), and increase in volume is not often used to convey greater intensity or to attract attention.. people at Warm Springs do not use changes or variation in voice loudness to attract attention in the ways that Anglos do. They do not talk louder and louder to attract the attention of those not alerted to a softer voice, or to give emphasis to some utterances,In general the spatial range over which the voice is used to attract attention is smaller (p.25).

Basso, in his book Portrait of the Whiteman (1979) describes similar communication behavior among the Apaches. "In ordinary conversation, Apaches address each other in low, softly modulated tones and at a pace they consider measured and deliberate....The speech of Whites sounds "too fast, too loud, and too 'tense', analogous to a muscle stretched to the point of pain" (p.55).

The following excerpt gives some insight into how an Apache may view the hearty enthusiasm of many interviewers.

"Whitemen make lots of noise. With some who talk like that - loud like that and tight - it sounds too much like they mad at you. With some, you just can't be sure about it, so you just got to be careful with them all the time." (quote from an Apache man, Basso, 1979 p. 55).

Enthusiasm in the MCSI frequently is judged by the applicant's response to the interviewer's statements. In Anglo culture, this response may include head nodding, smiling, eye contact, and utterances designed to show attention or agreement. Native Americans view listening from a different perspective. Indian listeners are stiller than Anglo listeners. Neither Indian speakers nor listeners look in the faces of other interactants as much as Anglo speakers and listeners do. The "yeses" and

"mmm hmms' common to Anglo listeners are not present in Indian listeners. For Indians, silence and stillness are signals that the listener is attending to the speaker (Phillips, S.).

In the MCSI, attentiveness to the interviewer and a quick, fluent response are often seen as signs of a competent communicator. In many Indian tribes, pauses between speaker's turns are longer. A mature and eloquent speaker is one who sits quietly and organizes his thoughts before speaking. In the Warm Springs tribe, they do not use the Anglo style of utterance by responding directly to a speaker by asking a question in response to a statement or making a direct statement in response to a question, nor do they seem to abide by the obligation Anglos do to give some kind of immediate response to every question. According to Phillips, "Frequently, questions are answered some time after they have been asked, with little syntactical linking." (Phillips, S., 1983 p. 55).

Native American and Anglo cultures have dramatically different views of appropriate eye contact in the communication situations. For most interviewers in the MCSI, appropriate applicant behavior includes strong eye contact and a firm handshake during introductions and the continued use of eye contact during the course of the

interview. Looking away is frequently viewed as a sign of shyness, lack of confidence, or in some cases, "having something to hide".

Among the Navajos, the Apaches, and other tribes, to grasp someone's hand firmly is to be disrespectful, intruding upon his spirit or his physical being. The following excerpt from Basso's (1979) research gives an overview of common Indian perceptions about touching.

Except when participating in activities that necessarily involve physical contact, Western Apaches are careful to avoid touching each other in public. This is especially true of adult men. Back slapping and vigorous handshaking are regarded as direct and unwarranted encroachments upon the private territory of the self....any form of touching that lingers without apparent reason can provide grounds for suspicion because of its homosexual overtones. (p.51)

S. Phillips and Basso both suggest that eye contact and touch are interpreted in a qualitatively different manner in Indian culture than they are in Anglo culture. Basso (1979) explained it in the following manner:

By Apache standards, Whitemen are entirely too probing with their hands and eyes, a distasteful tendency that Apaches take to be indicative of a weakly developed capacity for self-restraint and an

insolent disregard for the physical integrity of others. As one of my consultants put it: 'Whitemen touch each other like they were dogs.' (p.51)

S. Phillips (1983) states that some tribes believe that one who has spirit power may curse a person, intentionally or unintentionally, through looks. Whether tribes ascribe to this belief or not, most believe, like Anglos, that the eyes are very powerful message senders. Indian speakers, like Anglos, may pay a great deal of attention to listeners' eyes to determine how they are responding even though the listener and the speaker may not look as often, or as long, at the eyes of the other as do Anglos.

This is consistent with other Indian behavior concerning eye contact. While Anglos show consideration for a speaker by giving him their "undivided attention", or eye contact, Indians frequently show consideration for a speaker by looking away when addressed, because staring at the speaker might embarrass the speaker. In many Dakota Indian tribes, one signals a speaker who has unwittingly brought up a delicate subject by looking away, pretending not to hear, or changing the subject (Wax and Thomas, 1961). Among the Navajos, looking

directly into the eyes of an adult stranger is a sign of disrespect. Even within the family, respect to elders is shown by lowered eyes. (Christopher and Dingle, 1979).

Differences in perceptions of appropriate communication content, as well as behavior, exist between the two cultures. The appropriateness of the content of answers in the MCSI is considered a strong indicator of an applicant's desirability as an employee. The interviewer's perceptions of the interviewee's initiative, aggressiveness, confidence, and enthusiasm, while also influenced by the interviewee's nonverbal communication, are also dependent on the applicant's comments in the interview.

Instructions to interviewees on how to express these traits are found in many interviewing and speech texts (Downs, Smeyak, and Martin, 1980; Pearson and Nelson, 1982). Anglo applicants frequently have practiced expressing these traits through participation in community and family activities. "Tell the class about your summer vacation....tell Aunt Mary about your honor-roll report card....list all high school activities for your yearbook page..." are common examples of Anglo cultural practices.

In the Navajo tribe, to call attention to one's self is, at best, inappropriate, and at worst, inviting the gods to take back what they have given (Christopherson

and Dingle, 1979). To be found out of the ordinary is a source of discomfort among both Navajos and Apaches. Appropriate Apache behavior is to "blend in", and many feel that, in Basso's (1979) words, "Whites spend an immense amount of time absorbed with the powerful need to be publicly perused and to be regarded as separate and distinct from other people"(p.53).

Whitemen can look each other over. They do it all the time. They don't care about it....We don't talk about it-how somebody's look. Even he's real poor, or losing weight, or hurt bad...You do that and he's going to get mad at you. He thinks you looking him over - like he's some cattle in a corral. (quote from Apache man, Basso, 1979, p.54)

Among the Cherokees, harmony among men, not competitiveness, is a central value.

The harmony ethic is maintained by the recommendation that a good Cherokee must be a "quiet" man who avoids disharmonious situations. It is maintained by not giving offense, the unwillingness of the individual to thrust his ideas or personality in the limelight or to make decisions for or to speak for others. (Lujan and Dobkins, 1978 from Gearing, 1962, p.30).

Research with Cherokee college students reflect these values. General nonparticipation in classroom discussions, avoidance of direct eye contact with teachers, avoidance or refusal to answer direct questions which call for value judgments or personal opinions, and failure to ask questions are all used to describe the typical classroom behavior of Cherokee students at the University of Oklahoma (Lujan and Dobkins, 1978 p.4). If an Indian applicant demonstrates these same behaviors in the MCSI, he will probably be considered less competent than an applicant who behaves according to Anglo norms.

Native American cultural behaviors which reflect the belief that it is inappropriate to stand out or compete have also been observed by this researcher. During my first semester as a speech instructor at Haskell Indian Junior College, this behavior was observed during a simulated interview between a Navajo student and myself. The following dialogue, written from the researcher's recall after the interview ended, represents the student's first attempts to answer a question about personal accomplishments.

Interviewer: "Don, tell me what you have done in your life that you are most proud of.

Don:(in a monotone, looking at the floor) "Nothin"

Interviewer: "Everyone has done something that they are proud of,...what about something from high school?"

Don: (looking up briefly, then looking at the floor, says nothing)

Interviewer: "What about your grades?"

Don: "Uh,uh!"

Interviewer: "What about sports, did you participate?"

Don: "Yeah."

Interviewer: "Tell me about it"

Don: (looking at the floor) "I ran track."

Interviewer: "Did you win anything?"

Don: (looks up briefly) "By myself or with somebody?"

Interviewer: "By yourself?..."

Don: (looking back at the floor) "No."

Interviewer: (with relief as the game of 20 questions picks up) "Oh, how did you do on the team?"

Don: (expressionlessly) "We won district."

Interviewer: "That's great, that's something an employer can get excited about....It shows that you are competitive and can work cooperatively....Did you win anything else?"

Don: (looking back at the floor) "We won state too....."

Interviewer: "See, you have accomplished a lot, what about at college?"

Don: (after a seemingly interminable time, looks up with a quizzical smile) "Do you think an employer would care that I won Nationals in Cross-Country this spring?"

In many of the instances cited above, the Native American perception of communication competency varies considerably from the Anglo perception. Research on the majority culture selection interview suggests that it is the candidate who is enthusiastic, verbal, aggressive, and confident (Downs, 1969), and uses appropriate and high levels of verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Cohen & Etheredge, 1975; Hollandsworth, 1979,) who is behaving appropriately in the interview situation. Research relating to Native American cultural values suggests that it is the self-controlled individual, who does not need to boast (Basso, 1979; Lujan and Dobkins, 1978), who does not respond before carefully contemplating the issue (Phillips, S., 1983), and who values other individual's physical privacy and does not invade it with excessive

eye contact or physical invasion, such as a 'hearty' handshake (Lujan and Dobkins, 1978; Basso, 1979; Phillips, S., 1983) who is behaving appropriately.

To summarize, in an ideal world, all employment interviewers would be aware of and sensitive to cross-cultural differences and would not penalize an applicant for behavior, or the lack of it, which would not affect the person's ability to perform his job. However, research supports the premise that interviewers select applicants on the basis of personal characteristics (Downs, Smeyak, and Martin, 1980) and prefer applicants who reflect the interviewer's social norms (Raffler-Engel, 1983). Generally, interviewers prefer to hire applicants with "good" communication skills, regardless of the type of position he is being considered for. Realistically, employment interviewers, like most persons, are most comfortable with what they know and understand, and may unconsciously reject applicants who do not demonstrate 'skill' or 'competence' as the interviewer defines it.

Conclusions

The purpose of this current research is to provide an accurate description of the communication behaviors which do occur when a Native American applicant

interviews with an Anglo interviewer. While the literature on the selection interview, intercultural communication, and communication competence considers a vast number of variables by which to measure success in the selection interview, this research concentrates on a select number of these variables. Figure 2 outlines the variables which were selected for study in this research.

Figure 2
Communication Variables Contributing to Success in
the Selection Interview Considered by this Research

VARIABLE	RESEARCHER
Knowledge	Hymes (1971), Chomsky (1965) Argyris (1965), McCroskey (1982), Allen & Brown, (1976), Wiemann & Backlund (1980), Spitzberg (1983).
Motivation	Downs (1969), Drake (1977), Rubin (1983), Spitzberg (1983).
Nonverbal Behaviors: (eye contact, smiles, appropriate gestures, fluency of response)	Cohen & Etheredge (1975), Almalfintano & Kalt (1977), Young, & Beier (1977), McGovern & Tinsley (1978), Hollandsworth et. al (1979).
Verbal Behaviors	Downs (1969), Drake (1977) Hollandsworth et. al (1979), fluency of responses) Posner (1981).

The methodology used in this research study was designed to accentuate the strengths and avoid certain weaknesses which exist in earlier selection interview communication research. This study attempted to measure both nonverbal and verbal content in a selection interview situation. In order to approximate the wide variability of interviewee behaviors which occur in actual interviews, naive subjects were used and no attempt was made to control the quantity or quality of their communication behaviors. Two interviewers trained to use consistent interviewing techniques and a standard interview format were utilized to attempt to control for interviewer variations. Subject interviews were rated both objectively, by having coders quantifying nonverbal and verbal behaviors, and subjectively, with professional personnel interviewers serving as judges and rating the videotape on a fifteen item scale. This scale was designed to evaluate the qualitative content of interviewee verbal and nonverbal behaviors.

Because the Majority Culture Selection Interview (MCSI) can be a major stumbling block within the employment process for many Native Americans, there is a need for research which will help communication professionals and personnel interviewers understand the behaviors of the Native American applicant. Hopefully, this research will assist both majority culture

interviewers and Native American applicants in recognizing and dealing with existing communication expectations associated with the MCSI.

Chapter III gives an overview of the research methodology and the way in which it addresses some of the communication research issues considered in this chapter.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

In order to provide a broad-based description of Native American and Anglo communication behaviors in the selection interview, a variety of instruments and methods of analysis were utilized. This chapter focuses on the description of subjects and their selection, the methodology used to gather information about communication knowledge, motivation and behavior with these subjects, and the methods used to analyze this information.

Subjects

Three groups of subjects were used. Two groups were drawn from a pool of Native American students attending Haskell Indian Junior College who had declared an intention to complete a bachelor's degree and were currently enrolled in a required oral communication course. Students in this course were required to participate in an interview activity as part of a unit on the interview. Since Haskell's student population is split between students seeking a two year vocational, technical, or business degree, and students planning to transfer to a baccalaureate program, the selection of

subjects who were pursuing a four year degree increased the amount of academic goal similarity between the Native American and Anglo subjects.

This subject pool was divided into two groups. The first group (N=20) was randomly selected from the students who have indicated, through the survey, that they have lived mostly among Native Americans. The second group (N=20) was randomly selected from the students who indicated that they have lived mostly among non-Native Americans. The NPIC group N was reduced to 19 when data was analyzed due to the discovery of an incomplete data set. A damaged videotape further reduced the NPIC N to 18 before content analysis was completed.

The third group (N=20) was drawn from Anglo freshman and sophomore students enrolled in one of the oral communication classes at the University of Kansas. Students enrolled in these classes were required to participate in a research study as part of their course requirements. While non-Anglo students who signed up for the research study were eligible to participate in the study, only students who indicated on the information form that their race was "White", "Caucasian", or "Anglo" were used for the control group.

Research Procedures

Prior to assignment of subjects for the PIC (Primarily Indian community) group and NPIC (Primarily Non-Indian community) group, all students in the potential subject pool completed the Knowledge of Interview Communication Behavior Scale (KICB), the Subject Information Form (SIF), the Willingness to Communicate Scale (WTC) and the Self-Perception of Communication Competence Scale (SPCC). The rationale for the use of these instruments is included in the measures section of this chapter. A research assistant administered each of these instruments, first reading the instructions, and then answering any questions presented about the process by referring to the instrument instructions.

These instruments were completed during the class period prior to the interview session and subjects were assigned an individual appointment time to complete the next assignment in the interview unit.

Since subjects in the Anglo group participated on an individual basis rather than a class basis, participants signed up for an individual appointment slot. The Subject Appointment sheet stated that subjects would be participating in a brief simulated employment interview as part of their research participation, and that only

freshman and sophomore students were eligible to participate in this study. Thirty sign-up appointments, divided equally between males and females, were available. Equal numbers of male and females were assigned to each of the two graduate students who conducted the interviews. After subject participation was completed, 20 subjects were randomly selected for analysis.

Subjects in the PIC, NPIC, and Anglo groups followed the same protocol during the interview appointment. Subjects in the Anglo group completed the Knowledge of Interview Communication Behavior Scale (KICB), the Subject Information Form (SIF), the Willingness to Communicate Scale (WTC) and the Self-Perception of Communication Competence Scale (SPCC), following the same process delineated above for the PIC and NPIC subjects. Each subject read a brief summary of the procedures in which s/he would be participating and was asked to sign a consent form (Appendix A) at that time.

Following this, each subject was given descriptions (Figure 3) of four summer employment positions: summer day camp counselor/coach, salesclerk in a department store, laborer in a local park, or general clerical worker in an office. Subjects were instructed to select one position for which to interview, based on his/her interest, education, and/or experience. The position

descriptions designed for use in this research provided each subject with a position for which s/he could qualify on the basis of 'typical' life experiences common to both Native American and Anglo college students. The job titles and descriptions were drawn from the researcher's recall of students' informal reports of employment experiences during her tenure as Haskell's placement director and as a teaching assistant at Kansas University. Each subject was given five minutes to prepare mentally for the interview. No suggestions for preparation were given, and any questions which were asked were answered from information in the consent form or the instructions.

After five minutes, the interviewer greeted the subject and began the interview. Interviews lasted approximately 8 to 15 minutes, depending on the length and direction of the subject's responses. The interview format (Figure 4) was not designed to represent a full selection interview for a career position, but to allow subjects and raters to experience the context of the screening or preliminary interview. This time frame reflected a longer period of time than has been found necessary to evaluate nonverbal responses. McGovern and Tinsley (1978) in their research on interviewee nonverbal behavior, found that subjects' ratings after viewing 8, 12, and 16 minutes of a videotaped interview differed

little from their ratings on a four minute segment. Rasmussen (1984) used videotaped interviews of two to three minutes with positive results in his study of the effects of nonverbal behavior on selection interview outcomes. Two to four minute videotaped segments of selection interviews have also been used successfully by other communication researchers who measured both nonverbal and verbal communication (Speas, 1978, Barbee and Keil, 1973, Austin and Grant, 1981).

Subjects were videotaped during the interview. The camera was located directly behind the interviewer's right shoulder and approximately six feet from the subject. After completing the standardized interview the applicant was debriefed.

Figure 3 - Job Descriptions

The following ads are examples of summer jobs frequently available to college students. Select the one you would feel most comfortable interviewing for today. Spend the next five minutes mentally organizing the information about yourself and your background that you want to present in an interview for this position. The interviewer will call for you at the end of five minutes.

SUMMER CAMP DAY COUNSELOR

DUTIES: Work with groups of young people between the ages of 6 and 16. Organize sports and recreational activities and supervise craft projects under the direction of the camp director. No direct experience needed, but enthusiasm, dependability, and leadership ability are required.

OFFICE ASSISTANT

DUTIES: Answer phones, xerox, file correspondence, deliver mail. Relieve receptionist at lunch and breaks. No direct experience is needed, but dependability, the ability to follow instructions, organize and accurately handle paperwork, and work comfortably in an office setting are required. Clerical experience of any type is helpful.

RANGER'S AIDE

DUTIES: Assist park ranger in maintaining trails in state park. Use axes, picks, and chainsaws to clear paths. Patrol park area to provide assistance to hikers and maintain park facilities. No direct experience needed, but good physical condition, ability to work outdoors for long periods of time, dependability, and the ability to work without direct supervision are required.

SALES CLERK, CLOTHING STORE

DUTIES: Provide customer assistance, ring up sales, attach price tags to clothing and return clothing to racks, maintain an orderly and attractive department. No direct experience needed, but dependability, ability to work well with people, and accuracy in dealing with money and paperwork are necessary. An interest in clothing is helpful.

Figure 4
Interview Format

Interviewer Instructions:

Use the first few minutes of the interview to establish rapport with the applicant. Use follow-up questions and comments, when appropriate, to applicant responses. Cover all questions listed below.

1. Which position are you applying for?
2. Why did you pick this position?
3. What qualifies you for this position?
4. What type of work experience have you had that might help you do this job?
5. Who would you use for references for this position?
6. How do you think they would describe you?
7. Tell me about your educational background.
8. What subjects do you do best in? Worst in?
9. What are your career goals?
10. What do you do with your free time?
11. What is your biggest strength as a potential employee?
12. What is your biggest weakness?
13. I was really hoping to get someone (pick one: older, more experienced). Why should I hire you?
14. Do you have any questions about the position that I can answer for you?
15. I've enjoyed talking with you. I'll contact you later if you are selected for this position.

Interviewers

Interviews were conducted by a male and a female Anglo graduate student who were enrolled in graduate level work in Communication Studies at the University of Kansas and who had completed a course on professional interviewing under the direction of Dr. Cal Downs, Organizational Communication professor. Prior to videotaping subjects, pilot tapes were made by each interviewer, and were critiqued by the researcher and interviewers to standardize interviewing styles. As a result of this training, interviewers attempted to standardize their behaviors by providing similar levels of feedback and by avoiding the use of extensive secondary questions. Because the likelihood existed that training would not correct for all differences in interviewer behaviors, an attempt was made to control for other differences by assigning equal numbers of male and female subjects from each subject group. The two interviewers alternated interviewing subjects at both institutions, with one interviewing the first five subjects and the other interviewing the next five until all interviews were completed. In order to be consistent with the appearance of professional interviewers, the

male interviewer wore a sports coat, tie, shirt, and slacks and the female wore a dress suit with tailored blouse.

Judges

Four judges each rated 25% of the videotaped interviews. The judges, three of whom are actively employed as personnel interviewers, and one who had recently retired from personnel work, were selected based on their willingness to rate the tapes and their extensive interviewing experience, both on and off college campuses. The judges averaged 15 years interviewing experience. Because two were from Topeka and two were from Lawrence, all were familiar with both Haskell and the University of Kansas, though none of the interviewers had spent extensive time on either campus prior to rating the tapes.

Measures

A number of measures were used to provide descriptive information for this study. The Subject Information Form (SIF) was used to gather demographic data. The Knowledge of Interview Communication Behaviors Scale (KICB) was utilized to measure interviewee

knowledge of the interview situation. The Willingness to Communicate Scale (WTC) (McCroskey and Baer, 1985) and the Self-Perception of Communication Competency Scale (SPCC) (McCroskey and McCroskey, 1986) were used to measure variables relating to subject motivation. A nonverbal coding scale was used to quantify interviewee nonverbal behaviors in the interview and a content analysis form was utilized to measure verbal content. The judges' ratings of interviewee behaviors were measured using a modified form of Vernardo and Harris' (1973) Interviewer Rating Scale (IRS). Each of these measures is discussed in detail below.

Subject Information Form (SIF)

The SIF (Figure 5) supplied the demographic information necessary to classify subjects into appropriate groups for analysis. The format for these questions was drawn from Yumitani's sociolinguistic survey of students at Haskell (1986). The SIF was modified for the Anglo subjects. Subjects from this group were asked to identify their race, their major and their classification as a freshman or sophomore.

Figure 5
Subject Information Sheet
Haskell Students

1. LAST NAME _____, FIRST _____
2. DEGREE PLANS: (CHECK ONE) _____ 4 YEAR _____ 2 YEAR
3. LIST YOUR MAJOR: _____
4. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT CLASSIFICATION ? (CHECK ONE)
 ____ FRESHMAN (1ST SEMESTER) ____ FRESHMAN (2ND SEMESTER)
 ____ SOPHOMORE (1ST SEMESTER) ____ SOPHOMORE (2ND SEMESTER)
5. WHAT IS YOUR AGE? _____
6. WHAT IS YOUR SEX? ____ MALE ____ FEMALE
7. WHAT IS YOUR TRIBE? _____
8. HAVE YOU LIVED MOST OF YOUR LIFE ON A RESERVATION (OR
 IN A PREDOMINATELY INDIAN COMMUNITY BEFORE COMING TO
 HASKELL?
 ____ YES ____ NO
- IF YES, LIST RESERVATION OR COMMUNITY NAME:
 STATE: _____
- IF NO, LIST HOMETOWN OR CITY:
 STATE: _____
10. DO YOU PLAN TO GO BACK TO YOUR COMMUNITY AFTER YOU
 FINISH YOUR EDUCATION?
 ____ YES ____ NO ____ UNDECIDED

The subject information sheet for the University of Kansas students was identical to the one shown above for items 1 through 6. Item 7, the last item of the University of Kansas form, was "WHAT IS YOUR RACE?"

Knowledge of Interview Communication Behaviors (KICB)

The KICB (Figure 6), a 16 item written scale designed to measure subject knowledge of acceptable communication behaviors in the selection interview, was created to provide a method of determining the level of knowledge that the subjects had about appropriate communication behaviors in the selection interview. A search of existing literature failed to produce any established instruments to measure this particular knowledge area. The scales on the instrument were created from materials in Downs, Smeyak, and Martin's (1980) text on interviewing. Prior to this research, this instrument was piloted by administering it to 15 students enrolled in a history class at Haskell who were not currently enrolled in oral communications. All students enrolled in the history class had declared a baccalaureate major. Fifteen students enrolled in a public speaking class were used to pilot the instrument at the University of Kansas. Pilot subjects were told the instrument was being administered randomly to survey student knowledge of appropriate communication behaviors in the selection interview. A computer analysis of the internal reliability of this instrument resulted in an alpha reliability of .71, suggesting that approximately

the same rank order of individuals would be produced when different samples of test items were analyzed (Kerlinger, 1973).

Figure 6
Knowledge of Interview Communication Behavior

NAME: _____ Student #: _____

The following questions concern communication in the employment interview. Assume the interviewer is Anglo. Please answer each question to the best of your ability.

1. When an interviewer asks you to describe one of your weaknesses, you should:
 - a. tell him/her you don't have any that would affect your job performance.
 - b. ask him/her to clarify the question.
 - c. tell him/her about a situation or problem you have worked out a solution for.
 - d. any of the above are equally appropriate.
2. In an interview, the person who should talk the most is:
 - a. the interviewer
 - b. the interviewee
 - c. either, it depends on the participants
3. In an interview, you will do better if you volunteer information about your accomplishments which relate to your ability as an employee.
 - a. agree
 - b. disagree
4. If an interviewer doesn't seem very interested in your qualifications, you should keep trying to "sell" your suitability for the position.
 - a. agree
 - b. disagree
5. If an interviewer asks you what type of things you do best, you should tell him/her you like most types of activities.
 - a. agree
 - b. disagree
6. In general, interviewers consider strong eye contact and a firm handshake to be signs of a good self-image.
 - a. agree
 - b. disagree

7. If a person is interviewing for a job that doesn't require much work with other people, an interviewer will still be concerned with the person's ability to communicate with others.
 - a. yes
 - b. no
8. Interviewers view an applicant's avoidance of eye contact as a sign of respect for the interviewer.
 - a. agree
 - b. disagree
9. If you quit a job because you had a "rotten" boss, you should:
 - a. say you quit because of a personality conflict
 - b. volunteer information about how bad the boss was before the employer checks your references
 - c. be prepared to explain why you left without putting down the old boss
10. Appropriate behavior for an applicant preparing for an interview includes taking along a list of questions that you might want to ask or background notes on the job or company into the interview.
 - a. true
 - b. false
11. When an interviewer asks what qualifies you for the position you are applying for, you should:
 - a. mention course work that applies to the position.
 - b. mention volunteer work you have done that applies to the position.
 - c. mention long-term career goals that apply to the position.
 - d. all of the above
12. The appropriate response to the statement "I was really hoping to get someone older, why should I hire you?" is:
 - a. I feel I am mature enough to handle this job because... and give concrete examples of your ability to handle responsibilities.
 - b. recognize that s/he is just trying to hassle you,...ask him/her if you can give him/her a copy of your resume, and if s/he would like a copy of your transcript.
 - c. recognize that s/he wants you to assert yourself and display some self-confidence
 - d. a & c
 - e. b & c

13. When an interviewer asks what type of work experience you have had that might help you in the job you want, you should:
- a. tell him/her about unpaid work you have done for family or friends that relates to the position.
 - b. tell him/her about part-time or full-time jobs you have had and what you learned from them.
 - c. tell him/her, if you haven't held this position before, that you are eager to learn new skills.
 - d. all of the above
14. When an interviewer says he will contact you later if you are selected for the job, you should:
- a. assume s/he will call within a week if you are selected.
 - b. ask the interviewer if it is all right for you to check back with him/her later since it's sometimes difficult to reach you during the day.
 - c. send a letter to the interviewer within a few days of the interview thanking him/her for his/her time and expressing an interest in the job.
 - d. b & c
 - e. a & c
15. Which one of the following has the most influence on an interviewer's decision:
- a. work experience
 - b. educational achievement
 - c. personal characteristics
 - d. social standing
16. Interviewers consider a soft voice to be a sign of self-control in an applicant.
- a. agree
 - b. disagree

Willingness to Communicate Scale (WTC)

McCroskey and Baer's (1985) Willingness to Communicate Scale (WTC) (Figure 7) was designed to predict subjects' actual attempts at communication. Items are worded in a straight-forward manner and allow the subjects to estimate the amount, on a scale of 0 to 100, that they are willing to communicate in a variety of situations. This instrument was selected because of its clear construction and the degree of self-report it allows the subject. Existing research suggests that WTC scores also have predictive validity. Chan and McCroskey (1987) accurately predicted classroom participation based on students' WTC scores. A similar study done by Zahaki and McCroskey (1986) found that WTC scores accurately predicted students' willingness to participate in a communication research activity. Other instruments such as Duran and Wheelless' Communicative Adaptability Scale (CAS-SR) (1980), did not prove practical for this research due to the length of the 67 item instrument, since this research required the administration of four instruments and an interview during a short period of time. The lack of range in possible choices for the CAS-SR also contributed to the choice of the WTC.

The WTC is a 20-item instrument with 12 items composing the measure and eight filler items. Subjects were directed to choose the percentage of time they would

choose to communicate in a particular type of situation if they had complete free choice. The instrument allows scoring on seven scales: public, meeting, group, dyad, stranger, acquaintance, and friend. Each of these is scored by adding the scores of the particular items on the subscale and dividing by the number of items on that scale. A total WTC score can be determined by adding the subscores for stranger, acquaintance, and friend and dividing the total by three. A telephone discussion with McCroskey in October, 1986 resulted in the selection of the "stranger" subscale as the most representative of the interview situation. The items for the stranger subscale are 3, 8, 12, and 17. The stranger subscale score is determined by dividing the total of these items by four. The alpha reliability for the WTC was rated by McCroskey and Baer (1985) at .91 and .82 on the stranger subscale.

Figure 7
Willingness to Communicate Scale

DIRECTIONS: Below are 20 situations in which a person might choose to communicate or not to communicate. Presume you have completely free choice. Indicate the percentage of time you would choose to communicate in each type of situation. Indicate in the space at the left what percent of the time you would choose to communicate. 0 = never, 100 = always

- _____ 1. Talk with a service station attendant.
- _____ 2. Talk with a physician.
- _____ 3. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
- _____ 4. Talk with an acquaintance while standing in line.
- _____ 5. Talk with a salesperson in a store.
- _____ 6. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
- _____ 7. Talk with a policeman/policewoman.
- _____ 8. Talk with a small group of strangers.
- _____ 9. Talk with a friend while standing in line.
- _____ 10. Talk with a waiter/waitress in a restaurant.
- _____ 11. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
- _____ 12. Talk with a stranger while standing in line.
- _____ 13. Talk with a secretary.
- _____ 14. Present a talk to a group of friends
- _____ 15. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
- _____ 16. Talk with a garbage collector.
- _____ 17. Talk in a large meeting of strangers.
- _____ 18. Talk with a spouse (or girl/boy friend).
- _____ 19. Talk in a small group of friends.
- _____ 20. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.

Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC)

The SPCC (McCroskey and McCroskey, 1986) (Figure 8) was the second instrument used to operationalize the motivation variable. It was selected for several reasons. First, as McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) maintain, it is a straight-forward approach to self-report which asks subjects to estimate their own competence to communicate. It also has a high level of reliability. McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) reported an alpha reliability for this subscale at .87, with an overall alpha for total score at .92. The SPCC instrument has also been found to correlate strongly (.63 and .74) with the WTC scale. McCroskey, Richmond, and McCroskey (1987) report research which supports their hypothesis that self-perception of communication competence is a valid predictor of a subject's willingness to communicate. The efficiency of the SPCC also contributed to its selection for use in this research study, since it requires less than ten minutes to administer. The brevity of administration time is particularly important since this research requires the administration of four instruments and an interview without losing the subject's interest and cooperation.

The SPCC is a 12 item scale reflecting four communication contexts: public speaking, talking in large meetings, talking in dyads and with three types of receivers: strangers, acquaintances, and friends. McCroskey and Baer (1985) designed the scale to provide a straight-forward measure of subjects' perceptions of their own communication competence. Both a total score and a subscore for communication context and type of receiver can be formulated from subject responses. The 'stranger' subscale (items 1, 4, 7, 10) was used for this study. The score on this subscale was determined by dividing the total of the four subscale items by four (McCroskey and Baer, 1985).

Figure 8

Self-perceived Communication Competence Scale

DIRECTIONS: Below are 12 situations in which you might need to communicate. People's abilities to communicate effectively vary a lot and sometimes the same person is more competent to communicate in one situation than in another. Please indicate how competent you believe you are to communicate in the situations described below. Indicate in the space provided at the left of each item your estimate of your competence. Presume 0=completely incompetent and 100=completely competent.

- _____ 1. Present a talk to a group of strangers.
- _____ 2. Talk with an acquaintance.
- _____ 3. Talk in a large meeting of friends.
- _____ 4. Talk in a small group of strangers.
- _____ 5. Talk with a friend.
- _____ 6. Talk in a large meeting of acquaintances.
- _____ 7. Talk with a stranger.
- _____ 8. Present a talk to a group of friends.
- _____ 9. Talk in a small group of acquaintances.
- _____ 10. Talk in a large meeting of strangers
- _____ 11. Talk in a small group of friends.
- _____ 12. Present a talk to a group of acquaintances.

Interviewer Rating Scale (IRS)

An adapted form of Vernardos and Harris' (1973) IRS (Figure 9) was used in this study. This instrument was designed for interviewer rating of five critical interviewee behaviors identified by Prazak (1969) in his assessment of job interview behavior for rehabilitation clients. The five critical areas, measured in 23 items, included the ability to explain skills, the ability to answer problem questions, evidence of enthusiasm, appropriate appearance and mannerisms, and opening and closing the interview. These critical elements are very similar to those outlined by Downs (1969), Cohen and Etheredge (1975), and Hollandsworth, et. al. (1979) all of whom included elements of these critical behaviors in their findings on important interviewee characteristics. This matching of instrument elements with the research findings of the aforementioned researchers, coupled with the successful use of this adapted instrument by Speas (1978), made the selection of this instrument a logical choice. Because the original IRS instrument was designed to be used by social rehabilitation counselors and was further adapted by Speas in her work with prison populations, items which did not have face validity for the subject population used in this research study were discarded. The discarded items included references to the appropriate display of courtesy, the avoidance of

displays of anger or impatience, avoidance of smoking or chewing during the interview, and the appropriateness of explanation of the subject's prison record. The "probability of hire" item, added in Speas research, was retained to provide judges with an item which would allow for a global evaluation of the applicant. The item, "Rate this interviewer's skill in interviewing this applicant." was added to provide a measure of the judges' evaluations of the interviewers. This was done to detect any significant differences which might exist between interviewers which could impact interviewee performance. No significant differences in the judges' ratings of the two interviewers were identified when a oneway analysis of variance was performed on the item scores.

A reliability level of .82 was reported by Speas when the adapted IRS instrument was used by interviewers reviewing videotaped interviews. Rating was done on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being unacceptable and 5 being excellent. The minimum score possible on the adapted 15 item IRS instrument (Figure 9) used in this study is instrument was 15 and the maximum score possible was 75. The sixteenth item, relating to interviewer skill, was not included in IRS score computations.

Judges were trained by the researcher by first conducting a general discussion of each item to allow judges to clarify any questions. Next, each judge worked

independently using the IRS to rate a videotaped interview. They then discussed their ratings with the other judges. This process was repeated three times. After completion of the training process, interrater reliability on the scoring of the two videotaped interviews measured .85.

After the completion of the training period, judges worked individually to rate 25% of each subject groups' videotaped interviews. The judges were told that interview training of students was to be done at both the University of Kansas and at Haskell, and that their ratings of these tapes would produce base-line data for further comparisons. No mention was made of the Native American subjects' classifications as being from primarily Indian or non-Indian communities, and all Native American subject videotapes were randomly ordered for viewing.

Figure 9 Interviewer Rating Scale

Rater _____
Interviewee _____

Please rate the applicant's performance in the following videotaped interview according on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being unacceptable and 5 being excellent.

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Refers to skills, abilities, and other positive characteristics which relate to the position s/he is seeking. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. Maintains good eye contact with the interviewer. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Displays a confident posture, does not appear to be nervous or uncomfortable. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Verbalizes an interest in working and in the job s/he is applying for. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Speaks with eagerness, interest, confidence and alertness. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Emphasizes the positive rather than the negative. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. States willingness to accept the job requirements, salary, etc. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. Appears at ease in greeting and leave-taking; introduces self confidently and uses a firm handshake, stands when signaled that the interview is finished. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. Speaks clearly and audibly. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. Speaks an appropriate amount, speaks neither too little nor too much. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. Describes previous work, educational, or extracurricular experiences to support his/her ability as an employee. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. Responds appropriately to 'negatives' such as 'not experienced', 'too young', etc. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 13. Initiates appropriate questions about the position s/he is applying for. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 14. Speaks fluently, does not hesitate excessively or speak haltingly. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 15. Based on this applicant's performance in this interview, what is the probability that you would hire this applicant for the position that s/he applied for? | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 16. Rate the interviewer's skill in interviewing this applicant. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

Nonverbal Coding Scales

The nonverbal coding scales (Figure 10) were comprised of the six different nonverbal behaviors examined in this research study. Eye contact, smiles, headnods, positive gestures, distracting gestures, and latency of response were all quantified. Eye contact and latency of response were quantified by recording the number of seconds each was maintained. Smiles, headnods, positive gestures, and distracting gestures were all quantified by recording the number of times each occurred. All interviewee nonverbal behaviors were coded using the videotaped interviews. The first two minutes of each interview, beginning with the question "What position are you applying for?" and the last two minutes, beginning with the question "What is your biggest strength as a potential employee?" were the rating period used for the smiles, headnods, positive gestures, distracting gestures, and eye contact variables. By identifying specific questions from which to begin timing the behaviors, some consistency in terms of the point in the interview at which all subjects were rated was provided. Had the raters simply begun rating in the first two minutes and/or the last two minutes, variability in the amount of time spent on 'icebreaking' or 'leavetaking' would not have been controlled.

Rating periods were also selected to encompass interview questions which might present the greatest degree of comfort, i.e., questions relating to the position for which the subject had opted to interview, and questions with which the subject might be most uncomfortable, such as "What is your biggest strength as a potential employee?", "What is your biggest weakness?", and "I was really hoping to get someone (pick one: older, more experienced). Why should I hire you?". Justification for the selection of two two-minute rating periods is found in McGovern, Jones, and Morris' research (1978) which found that neither professional nor student ratings of interviewee nonverbals in videotaped interviews differed significantly whether they rated the first four, eight, twelve, or sixteen minute segments. This researcher replicated these findings through the rating of pilot tapes. The two coders who rated subject nonverbal behaviors coded the nonverbal behavior of two interviewees during the entire interview, using two minute intervals. No significant differences in the coders' recording of nonverbals used during these segments were detected.

Eye Contact

Eye contact was operationalized by measuring the percentage of time subjects engaged in eye contact. Eye contact was defined as the period of time during which the subject is looking directly at the camera, which was situated directly above and behind the interviewer's right shoulder. Exline and Fehr (1982) in Scherer and Ekman's Handbook of Methods in Nonverbal Behavior Research state that human observers are quite reliable, under optimal conditions, in determining the various aspects of a person's visual behavior. Fehr (1981) obtained reliabilities of between .88 and .99 in coding sessions on total gaze, look-speak, look-listen, one-way gaze, mutual gaze, and mutual no-look in videotaped sessions which ranged from 5 to 20 minutes. Figure 10 illustrates the coding form utilized for this measure.

Smiles

The same four minute segments were used to measure the smiles variable. A smile was counted if there was a slight tensing and drawing back of the corners of the mouth, along with the appearance of the naso-labial fold of the face. These guidelines were drawn from Ekman's and Friesen's (1975) Unmasking the Face.

Headnods

The headnods variable was measured by counting the number of times the subject nodded her/his head during a four minute measurement interval. Mehrabian (1972) defined head nodding as one cyclical movement of the head. The same four minute segment specified earlier in this section was used to measure the headnod variable.

Distracting Gestures

Distracting gestures were defined as hand movements generally considered socially unacceptable in Anglo society, including scratching, pulling at ears or eyes, and rubbing hands over parts of the body. These gestures were measured by counting the number of times they occurred during the four minute observation period.

Positive Gestures

Positive gestures were defined as the movement of arms and hands, either horizontally or vertically (Mehrabian, 1972), which were not listed in the criteria for distracting gestures. Coders were instructed to note any gestures that they were unsure of how to categorize. The four minute segment of the interview used to code the other nonverbal behaviors was applied to the positive gestures variable.

Latency of Response

Latency of response was defined as the average number of seconds elapsed between the end of an interviewer's primary question and the subject's first word within a statement, disregarding paralanguage such as 'uh' and 'ah'. Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, and 14, all but one of which are open ended questions, were used to measure this response. Because of the nature of the latency of response variable, specific question-answer segments, rather than the four minute segment of time utilized to measure other nonverbal behaviors, were used to define the measurement period. However, the question-answer segments measured were generally located in the same time utilized to measure the other nonverbal variables.

Coders

Two individuals with graduate-level coursework in research and methodology each rated one-half of the videotapes from each subject group. These coders were trained by the researcher by reviewing the coding instructions on the Nonverbal Rating Form (Figure 10), and reviewing and discussing the coding of individual pilot tapes. After four practice tapes were completed, the coders rated three more tapes on an individual basis. Interrater reliability on these tapes measured .80.

Figure 10
Nonverbal Coding Scales

Using the first two minutes of this tape, beginning with the statement of the question "Which position are you applying for?" and approximately the last two minutes of this tape, beginning with the statement of the question "What is your biggest strength as a potential employee?", code the following behaviors of the interviewee.

Use one a check mark for each occurrence.

Head Nods (rapid up and down movement of head).

Smiles (slight tensing and slight drawing back of the corners of the mouth, along with the appearance of the naso-labial fold of on the face).

Positive Gestures (movement of arms and hands either horizontally or vertically)

Distracting Gestures (scratching, pulling at ears or eyes, rubbing hands over body)

Number of seconds in direct eye contact with interviewer.

Latency of Response (number of seconds between end of question and first word of a statement, sentence, or question (do not count ahs, uhs, or similar noises, don't knows unless this is a final answer, I guess, ahs .

Record length of pause in seconds for each question.

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 11

Question 12

Question 13

Question 14

Content Analysis

An analysis of the content of selected interview questions was done to provide a description of the types and quantity of verbal information provided by subjects. Questions 3, 4, 5, and 6 which deal with the applicant's qualifications, experience, and references, were selected for analysis on the basis of their open-ended construction and the opportunity they offered the subject to provide substantial information about his/her knowledge, skills, and motivation to the interviewer. These questions were also selected to encompass information which cut across possible economic and cultural differences which might be reflected in questions about education or career goals.

The analysis of the content of these answers follows Berleson's premise (1952) that a quantitative description of communication content is meaningful. In this study, the occurrences of specific, general, or irrelevant statements in response to the interviewer's question(s) is based on Hollandsworth et. als' (1979) finding that the appropriateness of content of the interviewee's response to an interviewer's question is one primary indicator of a successful applicant. The general, specific, and irrelevant categories were drawn from existing selection interview texts such as Downs,

Smeyak, and Martin's (1980) and others who instruct applicants to use concrete, specific statements to support their skills and abilities, and avoid generalizations or irrelevant statements.

An adapted coding schema from the works of Downs, Johnson, and Barge (1986) was used to code the clauses within each response. To increase the ease and accuracy of coding, coding sheets were developed which delineated the job duties, skills, and desired characteristics for each classified position (Figure 3) for which subjects applied. The content analysis coding sheets (Figure 11) included written instructions which defined specific, general, and irrelevant statements and the identification of clauses, defined as being a group of related words that contain both a subject and a predicate and that function as part of a sentence.

For example, coders were instructed to record a check mark for each clause used to respond to questions 3, 4, 5 and 6, which dealt with the applicant's qualifications, experience, and references, respectively. Clauses were classified as relevant and specific if the interviewee used a concrete or specific example of a skill, ability, experience, interest, or personal characteristic which was applicable to the job description and/or requirements. Relevancy and specificity were defined to include information which

described either the length of time involved, conditions under which the activities were performed, where the activity took place, or how it applies to the position being discussed. Relevant and general clauses were defined as being applicable to the position under consideration or to work in general, but did not include references to either the length of time involved, quality of performance, details describing the performance or how it related to the position for which the applicant was applying. Irrelevant or negative clauses were defined as being inapplicable or inappropriate to the interview situation. For example, interviewee statements such as "I don't like taking orders from a boss." or "I'm good with horses." if applying for an office position would be coded as irrelevant or negative.

The same two coders used to code the nonverbal behaviors each rated one-half of the videotapes from each subject group. These coders were trained by the researcher by reviewing the Coding Instructions for Content Analysis (Figure 11) and by reviewing and discussing the ratings of individual pilot tapes. After four practice tapes were completed, the coders rated three more tapes on an individual basis. Interrater reliability on these tapes measured .90.

Figure 11
Coding Instructions for Content Analysis

INSTRUCTIONS

- 1) For each interview, select the coding sheet that matches the job for which the applicant is applying.
- 2) Record the applicant number and the video counter number at the top of the page. Be sure the applicant number matches the physical description of the applicant you are coding.
- 3) Use a check mark to record each clause which meets the definition of either a relevant and specific, relevant and general, or irrelevant or negative clause.

DEFINITIONS

CLAUSE: A group of related words that contain both a subject and a predicate and that function as part of a sentence

RELEVANT AND SPECIFIC CLAUSES: Refers to a specific skill, ability, experience, interest, or personal characteristic which is applicable to a job requirement. To be relevant and specific, the attribute must include information describing either the length of time involved, descriptions of the conditions under which the activity was performed, where the activity took place, or how it applies to the characteristic described.

RELEVANT AND GENERAL CLAUSES: Refers to a general skill, ability, or interest that would be applicable work in general or to the particular job being applied for but does not reference either the length of time involved, the quality of performance, details describing the conditions of performance or how it relates to the position qualifications.

IRRELEVANT OR NEGATIVE CLAUSES: Does not apply and/or is inappropriate to the interview situation. Presents a negative image of the applicant.

EXAMPLES

Relevant and Specific:

"I've maintained trails on my father's ranch" (for park ranger position)

"I've never been late to work." (for any position)

"My last employer trusted me to open the store in the morning and to close it at night."

"I've babysat my six year old brother after school for the last three years"

"I graduated with a major in business" (for the office assistant position)

Relevant and General

"I graduated from high school."

"I've worked on a ranch."

"I'm usually on time."

"I babysat"

Irrelevant or Negative:

"I don't like to take orders from a boss."

"I have trouble getting up in the morning."

"I'm good with horses." (for the office assistant position)

SUBJECT # _____

COUNTER # _____
ENDING # _____

SUMMER CAMP DAY COUNSELOR

	QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE QUESTIONS	REFERENCE QUESTIONS	TOTAL
WORK WITH YOUNG PEOPLE BETWEEN AGES OF 6-16.	SPEC _____		
	GEN _____		
ORGANIZE SPORTS AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES	SPEC _____		
	GEN _____		
SUPERVISE CRAFT PROJECTS	SPEC _____		
	GEN _____		
ENTHUSIASM	SPEC _____		
	GEN _____		
DEPENDABILITY	SPEC _____		
	GEN _____		
LEADERSHIP	SPEC _____		
	GEN _____		
OTHER POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS	SPEC _____		
	GEN _____		
IRRELEVANT OR NEGATIVE STATEMENTS	_____		

SUBJECT # _____

COUNTER # _____

ENDING # _____

OFFICE ASSISTANT

	EXPERIENCE	QUALIFICATIONS QUESTIONS QUESTIONS	REFERENCE	TOTAL
ANSWER PHONES, RELIEVE RECEPTIONIST.	SPEC _____			
	GEN _____			
ORGANIZE AND ACCURATELY HANDLE PAPERWORK	SPEC _____			
	GEN _____			
FILE CORRESPONDENCE, DELIVER MAIL, OTHER CLERICAL SKILLS	SPEC _____			
	GEN _____			
FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS	SPEC _____			
	GEN _____			
DEPENDABILITY	SPEC _____			
	GEN _____			
WORK COMFORTABLY IN AN OFFICE SETTING	SPEC _____			
	GEN _____			
OTHER POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS	SPEC _____			
	GEN _____			
IRRELEVANT OR NEGATIVE STATEMENTS	_____			

SUBJECT # _____

COUNTER # _____
ENDING # _____

SALES CLERK

	QUALIFICATIONS & EXPERIENCE QUESTIONS	REFERENCE QUESTIONS	TOTAL
PROVIDE CUSTOMER ASSISTANCE	SPEC _____ GEN _____		
RING UP SALES, TAG AND RESHELVE CLOTHING	SPEC _____ GEN _____		
MAINTAIN ORDERLY & ATTRACTIVE DEPT	SPEC _____ GEN _____		
WORK WELL WITH PEOPLE	SPEC _____ GEN _____		
DEPENDABILITY	SPEC _____ GEN _____		
ACCURACY IN MONEY AND PAPERWORK	SPEC _____ GEN _____		
OTHER POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS (INTEREST IN CLOTHING)	SPEC _____ GEN _____		
IRRELEVANT OR NEGATIVE STATEMENTS	_____		

SUBJECT # _____

COUNTER # _____
ENDING # _____

RANGER'S AIDE

	EXPERIENCE	QUALIFICATIONS QUESTIONS QUESTIONS	REFERENCE	TOTAL
MAINTAIN TRAILS USING AXES, PICKS, CHAINSaws.	SPEC _____ GEN _____			
PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO HIKERS	SPEC _____ GEN _____			
WORK OUTDOORS FOR LONG PERIODS OF TIME	SPEC _____ GEN _____			
WORK WITHOUT DIRECT SUPERVISION	SPEC _____ GEN _____			
DEPENDABILITY	SPEC _____ GEN _____			
GOOD PHYSICAL CONDITION	SPEC _____ GEN _____			
OTHER POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS	SPEC _____ GEN _____			
IRRELEVANT OR NEGATIVE STATEMENTS	_____			

Methods of Analysis

Both a multivariate analysis of variance (Hotelling's T) and a Pearson's Correlation Coefficient were used to analyze the data generated by the measures discussed above. A significance level of .05 was utilized to define significant difference for the multivariate analysis test. This level of significance is one which most social scientists accept (Bower and Courtright, 1984). When a significant difference between group means was found, a post-hoc test of statistical inference was conducted to identify where the significant differences occurred (Bower and Courtright, 1984). In this research, Fisher's Least Significant Difference (Fisher's LSD) procedure (Ott, 1977) was utilized to provide a multiple comparison between means and to identify which groups, the PIC, NPIC, or Anglo, differed significantly from each other. A critical difference between the means at the $p < .05$ significance level was determined.

A Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was used to provide a standard index of the relationship between the research variables. This test allows for the assumption of either positive or negative relationships and provides bounds at the upper and lower extremes, with all correlation coefficients falling between the range of

+1.0 to -1 (Bower and Courtright, 1984). The methods used to apply these measures to the research questions are listed below.

Research question 1a: "Do these groups differ in their knowledge of acceptable communication in the selection interview?" was answered by analyzing subject scores by groups on the Knowledge of Interview Communication Behavior (KICB) scale, a 15 item multiple choice answer instrument. KICB scores were obtained by computing the percentage of right answers from the total number of items asked. The multivariate analysis of variance test was then performed. When a significant difference between group means was identified ($p < .05$), Fisher's Least Significant Difference (Fisher's LSD) procedure (Ott, 1977) was performed to identify which groups, the PIC, NPIC, or Anglo, differed significantly from the others.

Research question 1b: "Do these groups differ in their motivation to communicate?" was answered by analyzing subject scores by group on McCroskey and McCroskey's (1986) Self-perception of Communication Competency Scale (SPCC) and McCroskey and Baer's (1985) Willingness to Communicate Scale. Scores on the WTC scale were determined by adding the subject's scores, ranging from 0 to 100, for the "stranger" subscale items 3, 8, 12, and 17, and by dividing the total of these

scores by four. The SPCC scale was computed in the same manner, using items 1, 4, 7, and 10 of the WTC "stranger" subscale. A multivariate analysis of variance was then performed on the WTC scores and the SPCC scores. When a significant difference between group means was identified using Hotelling's T ($p < .05$), Fisher's Least Significant Difference (Fisher's LSD) procedure (Ott, 1977) was performed to identify which groups, the PIC, NPIC, or Anglo, differed significantly from the others.

Research question 1c: "Do these groups differ in their nonverbal communications in the selection interview?" was answered by analyzing subject scores by group on specific nonverbal variables: eye contact, head nods, smiles, positive gestures, distracting gestures, and latency of response. Each is treated as a discrete variable. Head nods, smiles, positive gestures, and distracting gestures scores were computed by totaling the number of discrete occurrences recorded during the four minute observation period. Latency of response was computed based on the number of seconds which elapsed between the end of the interviewer's question and the beginning on the subject's response. This figure was then divided by eight, the number of question-answer segments observed, and the resulting total was considered the latency of response score. Eye contact was computed by converting the number of seconds of eye contact

recorded by each subject into the percentage of the 240 second observed interval it represented, resulting in a percentage of eye contact score.

A multivariate analysis of variance was then performed on each of the nonverbal variable scores. When a significant difference between group means was identified using Hotelling's T ($p < .05$), Fisher's Least Significant Difference (Fisher's LSD) procedure (Ott, 1977) was performed to identify which groups, the PIC, NPIC, or Anglo, differed significantly from each other.

Research question 1d: "Do these groups differ in the content of their responses in the selection interview?" was answered by computing the number of specific, general, and irrelevant clauses used to respond to interview questions 3, 4, 5, 6. The mean number of specific, general, and irrelevant responses per question were then computed and a multivariate analysis of variance was performed. When a significant difference between group means was identified ($p < .05$), Fisher's Least Significant Difference (Fisher's LSD) procedure (Ott, 1977) was performed to identify which groups, the PIC, NPIC, or Anglo, differed significantly from each other.

Research question 2: "Do interviewer ratings of Native American communication performance in the selection interview differ from their ratings of Anglos

if (2a) the interviewees have lived in predominately Indian communities? (2b) the interviewees have lived in predominately Anglo communities?" was answered by analyzing the Interviewer Rating Score (IRS) (Figure 9) by subject group. Fifteen items of the IRS were scored by the judges on a 1 to 5 Likert-like scale, with "5" being excellent and "1" being unacceptable. The IRS scores were obtained by totaling the 15 item scores, with possible scores ranging from 15 to 75. The sixteenth item, which rated the interviewer's ability, was not included in this score because it was analyzed individually to detect any differences in interviewer performance. No differences were found in the judges' ratings of the two interviewers. A multivariate analysis of variance was then performed on the scores of the 15 IRS items. When a significant difference between group means was identified ($p < .05$), Fisher's Least Significant Difference (Fisher's LSD) procedure (Ott, 1977) was performed to identify which groups, the PIC, NPIC, or Anglo, differed significantly from the others.

Research question 3: "What correlations exist between: knowledge of the selection interview, motivation to communicate, verbal and nonverbal behaviors relating to the selection interview, and judges' ratings of interviewee performance?" was addressed by performing a Pearson's Correlation

Coefficient test. This test was used to provide a standard index of the relationship between scores on the KICB, WTC, SPCC, and all verbal and nonverbal measures and the judges' ratings of the subjects on the Interviewer Rating Scale (IRS). Pearson's Correlation Coefficient tests was performed across all subjects, and by subject groups, to determine the strength of the relationships between these variables and the IRS scores.

Conclusion

Because this research study utilizes a variety of measures and methodologies to explore the communication behaviors of Native American subjects in the majority culture selection interview (MCSI), a summary which delineates these measures and the research methodologies utilized to analyze the results of these measures is included in Figure 12, providing an easily accessible reference to the overall research design. Chapter IV provides a description of the results of these analyses. A discussion of these results, including conclusions, limitations, and implications for future research is included in Chapter V.

Figure 12
Measures, Scoring, & Methods of Analysis

MEASURE	TYPE	SCORING
KNOWLEDGE VARIABLE:		
Knowledge of Communication Behavior	paper/pen self-report	% correct
MOTIVATION VARIABLE:		
McCroskey & Baer's Self-Perception of Communication Competence Scale	paper/pen self-report	% score
McCroskey & Baer's Willingness to Communicate Scale	paper/pen	% score
NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR VARIABLE:		
Head Nods	videotape	# occurrences
Smiles	videotape	# occurrences
Eye Contact	videotape	% of time
Positive Gestures	videotape	# occurrences
Distracting Gestures	videotape	# occurrences
Latency of Response	videotape	mean # seconds
VERBAL BEHAVIOR VARIABLE:		
Specific Responses	videotape	mean # occurrences
General Responses	videotape	mean # occurrences
Irrelevant Responses	videotape	mean # occurrences
INTERVIEWER RATINGS OF SUBJECT PERFORMANCE VARIABLE:		
Vernardo's & Harris's Interviewer Rating Scale	videotape	item ratings total

MEASUREMENT OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GROUPS

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed to identify significant differences between group means. Fisher's LSD procedure was performed to identify which groups differed.

MEASUREMENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN VARIABLES:

A Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was used to provide a standard index of the relationship between scores on the KICB, WTC, SPCC, and all verbal and nonverbal measures and the judges' ratings of the subjects on the IRS.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to provide an accurate description of the communication performance of Native American subjects in simulated selection interviews and to compare this performance to that of Anglo subjects in similar interviews.

In reporting research results each research question is presented, in turn, with a summary of the data generated by the particular analyses performed. Summary data includes the number of subjects, the group mean, the standard deviation, and the level of significant difference between groups. Group size for all research questions except 1.c were PIC n=20, NPIC n=19, and Anglo n=20. The NPIC group n of 19 occurred due to a lack of a complete data set from one subject in the NPIC pool. Both the NPIC and PIC subject pool were small due to the number of available students enrolled in the oral communication classes during the semester this study was conducted. One videotaped interview tape was damaged prior to the completion of the verbal content analysis, creating an n=18 for the NPIC on the specific, general, and irrelevant content measures.

A multivariate analysis of variance procedure, Hotelling's T, was used to identify significant differences between groups on Research questions 1 and 2 (Table 1). Kerlinger (1973) supports the use of multivariate analysis as being "...the most powerful and appropriate for behavioral scientific and educational research." (p.149). When a significant difference between groups was identified ($p < .05$), Fisher's Least Significant Difference (Fisher's LSD) procedure (Ott, 1977) was performed to identify which groups, the PIC, NPIC, or Anglo, differed significantly from each other. A Pearson's Correlation Coefficient procedure was used to provide a standard index of the relationship between the research variables explored in Research Question 3.

Review of Research Questions

Research Question 1: Do Native Americans differ from Anglo-Americans in communication behaviors related to the selection interview? If so, do Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Indian communities differ in these communication behaviors from Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities?

Specifically:

- (1a) Do these groups differ in their knowledge of acceptable communication in the selection interview?
- (1b) Do these groups differ in their motivation to communicate?
- (1c) Do these groups differ in their nonverbal communications in the selection interview?
- (1d) Do these groups differ in the content of their responses in the selection interview?

Question 2: Do interviewer ratings of Native American communication performance in the selection interview differ from their ratings of Anglos? If so, are Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Indian communities rated differently than those from Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities?

Question 3: What correlations exist between: interviewee knowledge of the selection interview, motivation to communicate, behaviors (nonverbal and verbal) relating to the selection interview, and the interviewer ratings of the interviewee's performance?

RESULTS

Table 1 summarizes the results of a multivariate analysis of the variables explored in the research questions. Tables illustrating the results of the analysis of the variables specified in individual research questions and identifying which groups differed significantly from each other are included in the results reported for specific research questions.

Table 1
Multivariate Analysis of Research Variables

Variable	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			F
	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	
<u>Research q 1.a</u>										
IRS	19	44.84	8.82	19	48.63	9.37	20	54.90	9.53	5.90*
KICB	19	72.68	14.07	19	74.32	11.47	20	78.60	13.06	1.10
<u>Research q 1.b</u>										
IRS	20	45.25	8.78	19	48.63	9.37	20	54.90	9.53	5.62*
WTC	20	32.50	22.16	19	49.26	17.64	20	37.40	15.93	4.08*
SPCC	20	46.90	27.20	19	60.47	19.99	20	47.00	20.83	2.24
<u>Research q 1.c</u>										
IRS	20	45.25	8.78	19	48.63	9.37	20	54.90	9.53	5.62*
Head nods	20	3.00	3.45	19	3.95	2.90	20	3.30	2.92	.47
Smiles	20	4.50	3.19	19	6.21	4.32	20	6.85	3.45	2.19
Pos. gestures	20	2.65	3.57	19	1.63	2.24	20	4.15	4.90	2.23
Dist. gestures	20	2.25	3.23	19	.37	.96	20	1.65	2.35	3.15
Eye contact (%)	20	45.79	15.67	19	48.18	12.10	20	50.79	12.70	.68
Latency response	20	5.34	3.73	19	3.40	1.92	20	2.49	1.35	6.48*
<u>Research q 1.d</u>										
IRS	20	45.25	8.78	18	48.17	9.41	20	54.90	9.53	5.72*
Specific	20	9.80	4.09	18	10.00	3.69	20	9.45	3.82	.10
General	20	2.00	2.25	18	1.67	2.35	20	2.05	2.48	.15
Irrelevant	20	.35	.93	18	.33	.59	20	.45	.61	.14

P < .05 level

Research questions 1.b & c Degrees of Freedom (2,56)

Research questions 1.a & d Degrees of Freedom (2,55)

Research Question 1

Do Native Americans differ from Anglo-Americans in communication behaviors related to the selection interview ? If so, do Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Indian communities differ in these communication behaviors from Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities?

1a. How do these groups differ in their knowledge of acceptable communication in the MCSI?

Hotelling's T test, a multivariate analysis of variance procedure, was performed to identify any significant differences ($p < .05$) between group means on Knowledge of Interviewing Communication Behaviors (KICB) scores (Table 2). The KICB was scored by computing the percentage of correctly answered items out of the 16 items asked on the multiple-choice instrument. Scores on this instrument ranged from 44 to 100 with a total mean of 75. No significant differences between groups ($p < .05$) were identified. The total difference between groups in mean scores was five percent, with the PIC group averaging 73% correct answers, the NPIC group 74%, and the Anglo group 79%. The total range of KICB scores was 44 to 100, with both the PIC and Anglo groups sharing

identical ranges. The NPIC group had a similar range of scores , 51 to 100. These results suggest that subject groups exhibit very similar levels of knowledge about appropriate interviewee communication behavior in the Majority Culture Selection Interview (MCSI), as measured by this instrument.

Table 2 Analysis of KICB Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	F
KICB	19	72.68	14.07	19	74.32	11.47	20	78.60	13.06	1.10

*p<.05

1b How do these groups differ in their motivation to communicate?

This question was tested by comparing scores on the Willingness To Communicate (WTC) scale and the Self-Perception of Communication Competence scale. Both the WTC and the SPCC scores had the potential to range from 0 to 100%.

Scores on the WTC represent the subjects' self-reports of the percentage of time they were willing to communicate with strangers. A multivariate analysis of variance (Table 3a) identified a significant difference (Hotelling's $T=.39$, $p<.05$) between groups.

Table 3a Analysis of WTC Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	F
WTC	20	32.50	22.16	19	49.26	17.64	20	37.40	15.93	4.08*

*p<.05

Fisher's LSD results (Table 3b) indentified the NPIC group as reporting a willingness to communicate with strangers a significantly higher percentage of the time than was the PIC group. The NPIC group mean was 49.26, s.d.=15.93. Neither the NPIC group nor the Anglo group (mean=37.40, s.d.=15.93) differed significantly on this measure, nor did the PIC group (mean=32.50, s.d.=22.16) and Anglo groups differ significantly from each other.

TABLE 3b
Identification of Groups which Differed on
"Willingness to Communicate" Measure

MEAN	GROUP	PIC	NPIC	ANGLO
32.50	PIC			
37.40	ANGLO			
49.26	NPIC	***		

*** denotes pairs significantly different
at the p<.05 level.

Data reported by McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) on their study of the WTC scores of students enrolled in an undergraduate communications course at West Virginia University (n=344) reported a mean of 36 on the stranger subscale with a standard deviation of 21. These scores suggest that the PIC group mean of 33, s.d.=22 and the Anglo group mean of 37, s.d.=16, on the WTC stranger scale are very similar to the West Virginia population mean. The NPIC group mean of 49% was 12% higher than that of the Anglo group in this research and 13% higher than the West Virginia population. These results suggest that Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities perceive themselves as much more willing to communicate with strangers in a dyadic situation than their Anglo or Indian counterparts.

SPCC scores (Table 4), representing the subjects' self-reports of their estimate of competence in communicating with strangers, were also analyzed. The SPCC scores had the potential to range from 0 to 100%. No significant differences between groups were identified, though the NPIC group mean was again 13% higher than the Anglo and PIC group means. Scores on the SPCC ranged from 5 to 93%, with the PIC group range being the greatest and matching the total range. The NPIC group and Anglo group ranges were similar at 18 to 93%, and 17 to 83% respectively.

A comparison of the means and standard deviations on SPCC scores produced by this research study and those reported by McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) showed very little difference between the grand mean and standard deviations of this research (mean=51.3, s.d.=23.42) and McCroskey and McCroskey's (mean=55.5, s.d.=23.6).

Table 4 Analysis of SPCC Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	F
SPCC	20	46.90	27.20	19	60.47	19.99	20	47.00	20.83	2.24

*p<.05

Research Question 1.c Do these groups differ in selected nonverbal communication behaviors in the selection interview?

This question was investigated using a variety of nonverbal communication behavior measures which included the quantification of the smiles, head nods, positive gestures, distracting gestures, eye contact, and latency of responses measures. The first two minutes of each interview, beginning with the question "What position are you applying for?" and the last two minutes, beginning with the question "What is your biggest strength as a potential employee?" was used as the rating period during

which the smiles, head nods, positive gestures, distracting gestures and eye contact variables were measured.

Smiles

The smiles variable was quantified by counting the number of smiles which occurred during the four minute observation period. A smile was counted if there was a slight tensing and slight drawing back of the corners of the mouth, along with the appearance of the naso-labial fold on the face. The smiles score was computed by totalling the number of smiles which occurred. Results of the multivariate analysis of variance (Table 5) failed to identify any significant differences ($p < .05$) between groups of this variable. The overall mean for this variable was 5.85, with a standard deviation of 3.75, with the PIC group mean being the lowest at 4.50, standard deviation of 3.18, and the Anglo and PIC groups being very similar at 6.21, standard deviation of 4.32 and 6.85, standard deviation of 3.45, respectively. The ranges in the number of smiles which occurred during the four minute observation period were very similar at 0 to 15 for the NPIC group, 1 to 11 for the PIC group, and 1 to 14 for the Anglo group.

Table 5 Analysis of Smiles Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	F
Smiles	20	4.50	3.19	19	6.21	4.32	20	6.85	3.45	2.19

*p<.05

Headnods

The headnod variable was measured by counting the number of times the subject nodded her/his head during the four minute observation period. No significant differences were found between groups on this measure when a multivariate analysis of variance was performed (Table 6). The overall mean for the headnods measure was 3.40, with a standard deviation of 3.07. A range of 0 to 14 headnods for the PIC and Anglo groups and 0 to 11 for the NPIC group was noted. The total mean for this measure was 3.40, s.d.=3.07, with group means being varying little at 3.00, s.d.=3.45 for the PIC group, 3.95, s.d.=2.24 for the NPIC group, and 3.30, s.d.=2.92 for the Anglo group.

Table 6 Analysis of Head nods Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	F
Head nods	20	3.00	3.45	19	3.95	2.90	20	3.30	2.92	.47

*p<.05

Positive Gestures

The positive gestures variable was scored by counting the number of positive gestures which each subject used during the four minute observation period. Positive gestures were defined as the cyclical movement of arms and either horizontally or vertically and excluded any gestures designed as distracting, such as scratching, pulling at ears or eyes, or rubbing hands over body. Results of a multivariate analysis of variance test (Table 7) failed to identify any significant differences between groups on this measure. A point of interest on these scores is the large range which exists in the number of positive gestures used by the PIC group (range=0-13) and the Anglo group (range=0-17). In contrast, the NPIC group range (range=0-8) was almost half that of the other groups. The mean number of positive gestures used by this group, 1.63, s.d.=2.24, while not significantly different from the other groups,

was approximately half the number used by Anglos. The total mean for this measure was 2.83, with a standard deviation of 3.83.

Table 7 Analysis of Positive Gestures Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	F
Positive	20	2.65	3.57	19	1.63	2.24	20	4.15	4.90	2.23

*p<.05

Distracting Gestures

The distracting gestures variable (Table 8) was measured by the number of distracting gestures which each subject used during the four minute observation period. Distracting gestures were defined as rubbing hands across body, scratching, or pulling at nose or ears. As was the case with the other nonverbal measures already reported, no significant differences were found between groups on this measure. Once again the standard deviation suggests a wide variability in subject behaviors, with the total standard deviation equalling 2.47 and the mean equaling 1.44. Also of interest is the low mean of the NPIC group (mean=.37). While the F probability for this measure (.0507) did not meet the significance criteria (p<.05) for this measure, these results suggest a tendency for

the NPIC group to use far fewer distracting gestures, and as mentioned earlier, far fewer positive gestures, than either the Anglo or the PIC groups.

Table 8 Analysis of Distracting Gestures Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	F
Distracting	20	2.25	3.23	19	.37	.96	20	1.65	2.35	3.15

*p<.05

Eye Contact

The eye contact variable (Table 9) was measured by observing the amount of time eye contact was maintained by the subject during the four minute observation period. The eye contact score equals this percentage of eye contact. A multivariate analysis of variance (Table 9) failed to identify a significant difference (p<.05) between groups.

Table 9 Analysis of Eye Contact Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	F
Eye contact%	20	45.79	15.67	19	48.18	12.10	20	50.79	12.70	.68

*p<.05

These results were unexpected in view of existing research done with Native Americans which suggest that the amount of eye contact used by Native Americans is significantly less than that of Anglos (Basso, 1979; Phillips, S., 1983). While the PIC group had the widest range of percentages, from 11% to 82%, a range of 71%, their mean percentage of eye contact, 46%, was only 5% less than that of the Anglo group's mean of 51%, and 3% lower than the NPIC mean of 48%. The percentage range for eye contact for the Anglo group was 48%, with the length of eye contact ranging from 34% to 82%. The NPIC group ranged from 26% to 70%, a 44% spread, on this measure. The mean percentage of eye contact recorded for all subjects was 48.26, s.d.=13.53, with the total range being the same as the PIC group range of 11% to 82%.

Latency of response

The last nonverbal variable considered was latency of response variable. Scores on this measure were computed by averaging the number of seconds which elapsed between the interviewer's completion of a question and the beginning of the interviewee's response. Elapsed time was measured on eight interview questions-answer segments (questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14) and the average length of elapsed time, measured in seconds, was used to represent the latency of response score. A

multivariate analysis of variance (Table 10a) identified a significant difference between groups (Hotelling's $T=.71$, $p < .05$).

Table 10a Analysis of Latency of Response Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	n	mean	s.d.	F
Latency	20	5.34	3.73	19	3.40	1.92	20	2.49	1.35	6.48*

* $p < .05$

The Fisher's Least Significant Difference (Fisher's LSD) procedure was performed to identify which groups, the PIC, NPIC, or Anglo, differed significantly from each other (Table 10b). The PIC group's mean score indicated a significantly longer pause time between question and answer than did either the NPIC or Anglo groups. PIC subjects averaged a 5.34 seconds pause before responding, while NPIC subjects averaged a 3.40 second pause, and Anglo subjects pausing an average of 2.49 seconds. The total mean for this measure was 3.75 seconds, $s.d.=2.79$. The greatest range in group scores was from 2 to 19 seconds for the PIC group. The Anglo group had the least range at 1 to 7 seconds, and the NPIC group was similar to the Anglo group with a range of less than 1 to 8 seconds.

TABLE 10b
 Identification of Groups which Differed on
 Latency of Response Measure
 (average # of seconds hesitation per question)

MEAN	GROUP	ANGLO	NPIC	PIC
2.49	ANGLO			
3.40	NPIC			
5.34	PIC	***	***	

*** denotes pairs significantly different
 at the .05 level

Summary of nonverbal variable measures

Contrary to other research findings regarding Native American communication patterns, the PIC, NPIC, and Anglo groups did not differ significantly on the smiles, headnods, eye contact, positive gestures, or distracting gestures measures. There was a significant difference between the PIC group and the NPIC and Anglo groups on the latency of response variable, with the PIC group using much longer pauses before responding. This finding supports earlier research which implied that many Native American cultures respond at a slower, more measured pace than do Anglos. These results also suggest that Native Americans who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities are more similar to Anglos than to Native Americans from predominantly Indian communities in their use of such pauses.

1.d Do these groups differ in the content of their responses in the selection interview?

A multivariate analysis of variance of the content of subject responses to selected interview questions were used to answer this question. First, responses to three questions, "What qualifies you for this position?", "What type of work experience have you had that might help you in this job?" and "How do you think your references would describe you?" were coded using three measures: the number of specific and the number of general clauses used to describe positive behaviors, abilities, interests, and motivations and the number of irrelevant or negative verb clauses used to reply to the same interview questions. After coding was completed, a multivariate analysis of variance was performed to identify any significant differences ($p < .05$) between groups on the specific, general, and irrelevant clause measures.

Specific Statement Measure

The multivariate analysis of the specific statement measure (Table 11) failed to reveal any significant differences between groups. All three groups used approximately 10 statements to respond to the three questions, averaging three plus specific responses per question. There was very little variation in the range of the number of specific statements used to answer

questions. The PIC and NPIC groups shared identical ranges of 1 to 17 specific statements, with the Anglo group having a similar range of 3 to 15 statements. The total mean for this measure was 9.74, with a s.d. of 3.81.

Table 11 Analysis of Specific Statements Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			
	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	F
Specific	20	9.80	4.09	18	10.00	3.69	20	9.45	3.82	.10

*p<.05

General Statement Measure

The same lack of significant differences between groups discovered through the analysis of the specific statement measure was found in the general statement results (Table 12). All three groups used an average of two general statements to respond to the three questions, averaging less than one general response to each question. The range in the number of general statements used by the groups was very similar, with the range for the NPIC group being 0 to 7, the PIC group 0 to 9, and the Anglo group 0 to 8. The total mean was 1.9, with a s.d. of 2.33.

Table 12 Analysis of General Statements Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			F
	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	
General	20	2.00	2.25	18	1.67	2.35	20	2.05	2.48	.15

*p<.05

Irrelevant Statement Measure

One of the most interesting results of the content analysis was the paucity of irrelevant and/or negative statements made by subjects. In addition to a lack of significant difference between groups (Table 13), there was an extremely low mean for the statements that were made. The total mean was .38, with a s.d. of .73. Once again there was little difference in the range of statements, with the NPIC and Anglo groups sharing a range of 0 to 2, and the PIC group ranging from 0 to 4.

*

Table 13 Analysis of Irrelevant Statements Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			F
	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	
Irrelevant	20	.35	.93	18	.33	.59	20	.45	.61	.14

*p<.05

*

Summary of Content Analysis Results

These results indicate that subject groups are much more homogenous in their use of specific, general, and irrelevant statements to respond to interview questions than they are in either their degree of motivation or their use of nonverbal communication behaviors. These results also suggest subjects know what statements are inappropriate and avoid using them, and that subjects have a tendency to use many more specific statements than general ones to respond to interviewers' questions. The results of research questions 2 and 3 reflect how these behaviors are perceived by the persons judging the interviews, and what degree of relationship exists between these variables and the judges' evaluation of the subjects' performance.

Research Question 2: "Do interviewer ratings of Native American communication performance in the selection interview differ from their ratings of Anglos? If so, do Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Indian communities differ in these communication behaviors from Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities?"

This question was answered by comparing group means on Interview Rating Scale (IRS) scores. Scores on the IRS scale were computed by adding the judge's rating of

the subject's performance on a 1 to 5 Likert-like scale, with "5" being excellent and "1" being unacceptable, on each of the 15 items relating to subject performance on the interview to create a total IRS scale score. The maximum score possible on this instrument was a 75, with a minimum possible score of 15.

IRS Measure

Four multivariate analyses of variance were performed to find whether or not significant differences existed between groups on IRS scores (Table 14a) and the knowledge, motivation, nonverbal, and verbal measures scores.

Results indicated that a significant difference existed between groups on each of the four analyses. The Hotelling's T was .23 for the knowledge and for the verbal content analysis, .71 on the nonverbals analysis, and .39 for the motivation analysis. The total IRS score mean was 49.61, with a standard deviation of 9.94. The range of IRS scores varied with the groups considered, with the Anglo group having the highest range at 35 to 73, and the PIC and NPIC groups sharing the smaller ranges at 30 to 58, and 30 to 60, respectively.

Table 14a Analysis of IRS Scores

	PIC			NPIC			ANGLO			F
	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	n	x	s.d.	
IRS	19	44.84	8.82	19	48.63	9.37	20	54.90	9.53	5.90*

*p<.05

Results of Fisher's LSD procedure performed on IRS scores (Table 14a) indicated that the Anglo subject group mean (54.90) was significantly higher than both the PIC group mean (45.25) and the NPIC group mean (48.63). Neither the PIC nor the NPIC groups differed significantly from each other. The standard deviations for all groups were consistent, averaging 9.23, with less than a one point variation between deviations.

TABLE 14b
Identification of Groups which Differed on
IRS Scores

MEAN	GROUP	PIC	NPIC	ANGLO
45.25	PIC			
48.63	NPIC			
54.90	ANGLO	***	***	

*** denotes pairs significantly different
at the .05 level

Individual IRS item analysis

Because a significant difference between groups was identified on the total scores of the Interviewer Rating Scale (IRS), a multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the individual items which comprised the scale to identify on which items groups differed (Table 15).

Table 15 Univariate F-tests - Interviewer Rating Scale Scores

ITEM:	n	PIC mean	s.d.	n	NPIC mean	s.d.	n	ANGLO mean	s.d.	F
1) relates characteristics	20	3.40	.68	19	3.37	.68	20	3.90	.90	2.98
2) maintains eye contact	20	2.70	.73	19	3.05	.78	20	3.35	.74	3.74*
3) presents confident posture	20	2.90	.72	19	3.37	.76	20	3.30	.80	2.18
4) verbalizes interest	20	3.15	.74	19	3.42	.77	20	3.85	.80	4.39*
5) speaks with interest/confiden.	20	2.90	.85	19	3.37	.90	20	3.80	.70	6.06*
6) emphasizes positives	20	3.35	.67	19	3.32	.67	20	3.85	.68	4.27*
7) states willingness to accept job	20	2.95	.39	19	3.26	.65	20	3.65	.67	7.18*
8) appears at ease introduction/exit	20	2.95	.69	19	3.26	.65	20	3.65	.87	4.41*
9) speaks clearly and audibly	20	2.75	.72	19	2.95	.78	20	3.65	.67	8.54*
10) speaks appropriate amount	20	2.90	.72	19	3.37	.83	20	3.70	.73	5.58*
11) describes experiences	20	3.35	.87	19	2.47	.90	20	3.80	.83	1.42
12) responds approp. to negat.	20	2.90	.97	19	3.00	.82	20	3.55	.76	3.35*
13) initiates ?s on position	20	2.85	.81	19	2.68	.82	20	3.20	.89	1.91
14) speaks fluently no excess/hesitat.	20	2.90	.79	19	3.10	.81	20	3.85	.74	8.17*
15) probability of hiring this person	20	3.30	.98	19	3.37	1.12	20	3.80	.95	1.42
total IRS score	20	45.25	8.78	19	48.63	9.37	20	54.90	9.53	5.62*

*p < .05 Degrees of freedom 2,56

This analysis was followed by the application of Fisher's LSD procedure to identify which groups differed from the others. No significant differences were found between groups on six of the items (Table 16). A particularly salient result of this analysis was that while both the NPIC and PIC group means were significantly ($p < .05$) lower than the Anglo group's on the total IRS score, there was no significant difference in group means on IRS item 15 which dealt with the probability that the judge would hire the subject if a position were available.

Table 16 IRS Items on which
No Significant Differences between Groups were Found

ITEM:	n	PIC mean	s.d.	n	NPIC mean	s.d.	n	ANGLO mean	s.d.	F
1) relates characteristics	20	3.40	.68	19	3.37	.68	20	3.90	.90	2.98
3) presents confident posture	20	2.90	.72	19	3.37	.76	20	3.30	.80	2.18
11) describes experiences	20	3.35	.87	19	2.47	.90	20	3.80	.83	1.42
13) initiates ?s on position	20	2.85	.81	19	2.68	.82	20	3.20	.89	1.91
15) probability of hiring this person	20	3.30	.98	19	3.37	1.12	20	3.80	.95	1.42

$p < .05$

The PIC group was rated significantly lower than the Anglo group on 10 of the 15 items (Tables 17 & 18) which

made up the scale. The PIC group was rated lower than the Anglo group on several items which current research on Native American cultures suggest are culturally related. These items include the use of eye contact, speaking the appropriate amount, speaking with interest and confidence, and appearing at ease in introduction and exit. The PIC group was also significantly lower than the Anglo group on the item relating to the verbalization of interest in working.

Table 17 IRS Items on which PIC Group
Scored Significantly Lower than Anglo Group

ITEM:	n	PIC mean	s.d.	n	NPIC mean	s.d.	n	ANGLO mean	s.d.	F
2) maintains eye contact	20	2.70	.73	19	3.05	.78	20	3.35	.74	3.74*
4) verbalizes interest	20	3.15	.74	19	3.42	.77	20	3.85	.80	4.39*
5) speaks with interest/confiden.	20	2.90	.85	19	3.37	.90	20	3.80	.70	6.06*
8) appears at ease introduction/exit	20	2.95	.69	19	3.26	.65	20	3.65	.87	4.41*
10) speaks appro- priate amount	20	2.90	.72	19	3.37	.83	20	3.70	.73	5.58*

$p < .05$

The NPIC group was rated significantly lower than the Anglo group on five of the same 10 items on which the PIC group received lower ratings than the Anglo group.

Both the PIC and NPIC group were rated lower on items dealing with fluency, audibleness and clarity of speech, and statements dealing with the degree of positiveness included in their answers.

Table 18 IRS Items on which NPIC and PIC Groups
Scored Significantly Lower than Anglo Group

ITEM:	n	PIC mean	s.d.	n	NPIC mean	s.d.	n	ANGLO mean	s.d.	F
6) emphasizes positives	20	3.35	.67	19	3.32	.67	20	3.85	.68	4.27*
7) states willing- ness to accept job	20	2.95	.39	19	3.26	.65	20	3.65	.67	7.18*
9) speaks clearly and audibly	20	2.75	.72	19	2.95	.78	20	3.65	.67	8.54*
12) responds approp. to negat.	20	2.90	.97	19	3.00	.82	20	3.55	.76	3.35*
14) speaks fluently no excess/hesitat.	20	2.90	.79	19	3.10	.81	20	3.85	.74	8.17*

p < .05

In summary, both the PIC and NPIC groups were rated significantly lower than the Anglo group on overall interview performance, though no significant differences were found between group scores on the probability of hire item. PIC subjects were rated significantly lower than Anglo subjects on 10 of the 15 IRS items, with NPIC subjects being rated significantly lower than the Anglo subjects on five of the same items. The PIC and NPIC subjects failed to differ significantly from each other on any IRS item nor on total IRS scores.

Research Question 3 "What correlations exist between: knowledge of the selection interview, motivation to communicate, behaviors (nonverbal and verbal) relating to the selection interview, and the interviewer ratings of the interviewee's performance?"

A Pearson's Correlation Coefficient test was used to answer this question. This test provided a standard index of the relationship between the knowledge, motivation, verbal and nonverbal variables and the interviewer ratings on the subjects on these variables. The Pearson's Correlation Coefficient tests were performed across all subjects, and by subject groups, in order to provide a description of relationships between variables and judges' ratings which were common to all subjects and to identify those relationships that may be unique to particular subject groups. These correlations are listed in Table 19.

Table 19

**Correlations of Variables with
Interview Rating Scale Variable**

GROUPS	ALL n=59	PIC n=20	NPIC n=19	ANGLO n=20
VARIABLE:				
KICB	.21	.24	.23	-.02
WTC	.08	-.01	.18	.05
SPCC	.06	-.10	-.03	.42
HEADNODS	-.07	-.13	-.26	.11
SMILES	.15	.12	-.13	.23
POS. GESTURES	.18	.21	.10	.08
DIS. GESTURES	-.30	-.35	-.18	-.41
EYE CONTACT	.25	.25	.04	.32
LATENCY/RESPONSE	-.36*	-.58*	.27	-.19
SPECIFIC+	.54*	.61*	.58*	.64*
GENERAL+	-.08	-.17	-.22	.06
IRREL+	-.06	-.40	.34	-.06

+ ALL n=58
NPIC n=18

*P<.01

The highest correlations existed between the latency of response and specificity of response variables and the IRS scores. The latency of response scores, computed by averaging the length of time elapsed between the end of the interviewer's question and the beginning of the interviewee's response, correlated negatively at $r = -.39$ ($P = .001$) with the IRS scores. The specificity of response variable, analyzed by quantifying the number of verb clauses used by the subject to respond to interview questions which could be defined as being relevant and specific, correlated at the $r = .52$ ($P = .001$) with the IRS scores.

The strength of the correlation of the specificity of response variable with IRS scores, both across all subjects and within each subject group, confirms Hollandsworth et. al's (1979) research results. Those research results suggested that the content of applicant responses was the single most important factor in interviewer ratings of applicants. The strength of the correlation of the latency of response variable to IRS scores supports earlier research (Bolster and Springbett, 1961; Webster, 1964) which found that information which is perceived as negative by interviewers affects the rating of applicants more than does positive information.

The latency of response variable's strong negative correlation to IRS scores also suggests the possibility

that the interviewee's response on this variable is strongly influenced by culture. The latency of response measure's inverse correlation with IRS scores was significant across all subjects. However, when correlations were performed by subject groups, only the PIC group's scores correlated significantly, in an inverse manner, with IRS scores. This within group correlation was so strong ($r = -.58$) that it appears to have influenced the overall correlation score ($r = -.36$). As mentioned earlier, Native American communication patterns are frequently typified by longer pause between speakers than are found in Anglo communication patterns (Basso, 1979, Phillips, 1983). The strength of the negative correlation also suggests that this response pattern is viewed as inappropriate by the personnel professionals who judged the videotaped interviews.

Conclusions

The analysis of the data used to answer the basic research questions yielded some interesting results. Little difference was seen between groups in their knowledge of acceptable communication behaviors, as tested in a comparison of scores on the Knowledge of Interview Communication Behavior (KICB) scale. Differences in motivation to communicate were

operationalized by comparing group scores on the Willingness to Communicate (WTC) and Self-Perception of Communication Competence (SPCC) scales. None of the groups differed significantly on the SPCC scores. When group WTC scores were compared, the NPIC group scores were found to be significantly higher than those of the PIC group, with no other significant differences being found between groups. While this information provides a basis for speculation on the reason for this difference, the lack of correlation of the SPCC and WTC scores to the IRS scores supports McCroskey and Baer's (1985) premise that self-perceived communication competence and willingness to communicate do not make an individual a competent communicator.

In terms of nonverbal behaviors, the only significant differences were found on the latency of response variable. The multivariate analysis of variance of the smiles, head nods, positive gestures, distracting gestures, and eye contact variables, did not find any significant differences between any of the three subject groups. The lack of a significant difference on the eye contact variable fails to support existing research on Native Americans that maintains that Native Americans, in general, tend to use eye contact less than their Anglo counterparts. One may consider, on the basis of apparently conflicting research, whether the difference

in eye contact is a quantitative or a qualitative one. This possibility seems particularly salient since the percentage of observed eye contact did not vary between Anglo and Indian groups, but the judges' rating of the PIC group's eye contact on the IRS was significantly lower than that of the Anglo group.

Perhaps the most significant results on the nonverbal measures relate to the latency of response measure, with the PIC groups waiting significantly longer than either their NPIC or Anglo counterparts before responding to interview questions. This measure also demonstrated a significant negative correlation with IRS scores across groups ($r = -.30$, $p < .001$) but only correlated significantly within the PIC group. The PIC group latency of response measure, correlating at $r = -.58$ ($P < .001$) with the IRS scores, suggests that the pervasiveness of this behavior in the PIC group strongly influenced the correlation across groups. Since researchers (Basso, 1979; Christopherson and Dingle, 1979; Phillips, S, 1983) have suggested that the use of pauses is a communication characteristic associated with Native Americans rather than Anglos, and selection interviewer researchers (Downs, 1969, Hollandsworth 1979) have established aggressiveness, confidence, and fluency of speech as desirable interviewee characteristics in the Majority Culture Selection Interview (MCSI), the possibility that

cultural differences negatively influence the interview outcome must be considered.

It is noteworthy that the only significant correlation on the nonverbal behaviors was negative in nature, lending support to earlier research (Bolster and Springbett, 1961; Webster, 1964) on the selection interview. Their research maintains that interviewee responses which are perceived negatively by the interviewer outweigh positive information provided by the interviewee.

The analysis of the content of the subjects' interview responses suggests few differences between the NPIC and PIC groups and the Anglo group. Of the 13 variables correlated with IRS scores, the specificity of response variable showed the strongest correlation (.54, $P < .01$) both across subject groups and within each subject groups. This finding supports Hollandsworth et. al's research (1979) which established appropriateness of content as more important than nonverbal communication behaviors in determining interview outcomes. However, in considering the judges' lower ratings of the PIC and NPIC subjects on IRS item 6, "Emphasizes positives rather than negatives.", the question may be raised as to whether it is sufficient to be specific and relevant. It would appear that interviewees who are perceived as communicating specific, relevant, and positive, rather

than neutral or negative, information obtain the higher ratings. Existing research on Indian cultural values, which implies that boasting, calling attention to one's activities, or competing (Basso, 1979; Phillips, S. 1983) are inappropriate behaviors is in conflict with majority culture values as they relate to the MCSI. The implications of these findings will be considered in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter reviews the goals of this research study and lists the six major conclusions drawn from the results of this study. A discussion of these conclusions follows. This chapter is concluded with a discussion of the limitations of this study, possible applications of this research, and suggestions for further research.

The goal of this study was designed to provide an accurate description of the communication performance of Native American subjects in simulated selection interviews and to compare this performance to that of Anglo subjects in similar interviews. Three major research questions were utilized to meet this goal:

Research Question 1: Do Native Americans differ from Anglo-Americans in communication behaviors related to the selection interview? If so, do Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Indian communities differ in these communication behaviors from Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities?

Specifically:

- 1a Do these groups differ in their knowledge of acceptable communication in the selection interview?
- 1b Do these groups differ in their motivation to communicate?
- 1c Do these groups differ in their nonverbal communications in the selection interview?
- 1d Do these groups differ in the content of their responses in the selection interview?

Research Question 2: Do judges' ratings of Native American communication performance in the selection interview differ from their ratings of Anglos? If so, are Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Indian communities rated differently than those Native American subjects who have lived in predominantly Anglo communities?

Research Question 3: What relationships exist between: knowledge of the selection interview, motivation to communicate, nonverbal and verbal behaviors relating to the selection interview, and the judges' ratings of the interviewee's performance?

Conclusions

1. There appears to be no significant relationship between either knowledge of acceptable communication in the selection interview or motivation to communicate and interview outcomes.

2. The strongest correlate to interviewee success across groups is the use of specific statements to describe qualifications and abilities.

3. With the exception of the difference in subject use of pauses, termed latency of response, no significant differences exist in the quantity of the observed nonverbal and verbal behaviors exhibited by Native American and Anglo subjects in the interview. A significant difference between groups in latency of response, which appears to be culturally related, does exist, however, and this behavior correlates inversely and significantly with judges' ratings of interviewee performance.

4. Judges perceive Anglo subjects to communicate more competently in the selection interview than do Native American subjects, even though few quantified differences in nonverbal and verbal content were detected. These

results suggest that a.) qualitative differences in interviewee communication behaviors may exist which were not detected by this research study's methodologies and/or b.) other variables may adversely affect interview ratings of Native American subjects.

5. Native American subjects from primarily Indian communities demonstrate less intercultural communication adaption in the majority culture interview situation than do either the Native American subjects from Anglo communities or Anglo subjects. This level of adaption appears to be related to a lack of experience and/or skill in the intercultural communication situation rather than to a lack of motivation to communicate or a lack of knowledge of the interview situation.

6. The lack of demonstrable intercultural adaption to majority culture communication norms may also negatively impact the opportunities of Native Americans in areas other than the interview situation.

Discussion of Conclusions

1. First, there appears to be no significant relationship between either knowledge of acceptable communication in the selection interview or motivation to communicate and interview outcomes.

A generally accepted component of communication competence is knowledge (McCroskey, 1982; Weimann and Backlund, 1980). For the purpose of this research, knowledge about selection interview communication behavior was measured by subject scores on the Knowledge of Interview Communication Behaviors (KICB). Results of a multivariate analysis of variance found no significant differences between the PIC, the NPIC, and Anglo groups ($p > .05$) nor did results of a Pearson's Correlation suggest a significant relationship between KICB scores and interview outcomes, as measured by scores on the Interview Rating Scale (IRS).

Based on these findings, it appears that knowledge of the interview situation is neither culturally based nor a major correlate of interview performance. Several explanations for this may exist. One explanation is based on the premise of communication competency theorists Allen and Brown (1976), Rubin, R. (1983), and Spitzberg (1983) who maintain that knowledge of appropriate communication

behavior is a necessary, but not sufficient, component of communication competence; i.e., the actual performance of the communication must be present before the person can be considered competent.

The lack of significant differences between groups on the knowledge variable also implies that neither the lack of knowledge, nor knowledge of the interviewing situation is culturally related. This lack of difference may be attributed to the background of the subjects. Since all subjects were college freshmen or sophomores within four weeks of completing a college level oral communication class, the assumption can be made that most had been exposed to the importance of both nonverbal and verbal communication in communication situations. This, combined with possible interviewing experience or training prior to participating in this research, may account for the lack of significant differences between groups.

When the results of the research question relating to motivation to communicate are examined, one finds that Native American subjects (NPIC) who reported having lived in predominantly Anglo communities (NPIC), perceived themselves as significantly more competent to communicate than the Native American subjects who have lived in primarily Indian communities (PIC). However, the NPIC subject group's perception, based on subject scores on

McCroskey's (1985) Willingness to Communication (WTC) scales, did not appear to affect their competence in the interview situation. Results of a Pearson's Correlation Test on WTC scores and IRS scores failed to establish a significant correlation ($r=.07$, $p>.28$) between these variables.

The significantly higher scores of the NPIC group on the Willingness To Communicate scales may be related to the NPIC subjects current educational situation. While these subjects have lived in predominantly Anglo communities, they are currently attending a college whose student population is totally Native American. These students, according to anecdotal remarks of faculty, perceive themselves as more willing to communicate than their counterparts who have lived predominantly among Native Americans, and are more willing, in general, to communicate in class than are students from predominantly Indian communities.

If communication competence theorists (Weimann and Backlund, 1976; Rubin, 1983; Spitzberg, 1983) who consider motivation as an integral component of communication competence are correct, then one would expect: 1) a significant correlation between the WTC and IRS scores and interview performances, and 2) that this correlation would be particularly significant in the NPIC group. However,

the lack of a significant relationship between WTC and IRS scores ($r=.10$, $p<.22$) lends some credence to McCroskey's research on communication reticence and self-perception of communication competence. This research suggests that neither willingness of communicate nor self-perception of communication competence are valid predictors of the communication ability of the subject.

In summary, it appears that while knowledge of and motivation to communicate may be considered necessary components of communication competence, neither motivation nor knowledge of the interview situation appear to be significant factors in subject interview performance. This is not the case when actual communication performance is examined, as is the case in the following conclusion.

2. The strongest correlate to interviewee success across groups is the use of specific statements to describe qualifications and abilities.

The results of this research suggest that appropriate content is the single most important variable in determining hiring decisions. Specificity of response, more than any other variable, correlated with IRS scores ($r=.53$, $p<.0005$). The specificity variable, however, was a quantitative, not a qualitative measure. This variable was operationalized by counting the number of specific,

positively or neutrally oriented verb clauses made by the subjects, and no attempt was made to rate the degree of positiveness of the responses.

A multivariate analysis of this variable failed to establish significant differences between the PIC and NPIC groups and the Anglo groups on this variable. However, a major discrepancy appears to exist between the lack of significant differences between subject groups on the specificity of response variable and the significant differences between interviewer ratings of NPIC and PIC subjects and Anglo subjects on interview performance.

Examination of the judge's ratings of applicant performance on the individual items which make up the IRS scale identified five items on which both the PIC and NPIC groups scored significantly lower than the Anglo group. Two of these relate to the manner with which negative information is handled in the interview in items such as "Emphasizes the positive rather than the negative", "Responds appropriately to negatives such as 'not experienced', 'too young', etc.'." The other three items pertain to nonverbal behaviors. The consistent rating of both PIC and NPIC subjects on these items suggests that either a significant qualitative difference in their responses exists or that other variables not considered in

this research impact the interviewers' perception of Native American subjects' performance. These will be further amplified in conclusion #4.

3. With the exception of the difference in subject use of pauses, termed latency of response, no significant differences exist in the quantity of the observed nonverbal and verbal behaviors exhibited by Native American and Anglo subjects in the interview. A significant difference between groups in latency of response, which appears to be culturally related, does exist, however, and this behavior correlates inversely and significantly with judges' ratings of interviewee performance.

This research focused on six nonverbal behaviors and three verbal behaviors and their relationship to hiring decisions. Differences between subject groups on these behavior variables were also examined. The three verbal behaviors examined were the use of specific, general, and irrelevant statements used by subjects to respond to interviewer questions. No significant differences were found between any groups on these variables. The six nonverbal behaviors which were quantified by this study were headnods, smiles, positive gestures, distracting gestures, eye contact, and latency of response. Only one

of these, the latency of response variable, correlated significantly with interviewers' ratings of subject performance ($r = -.36$, $p < .01$).

Latency of response appears to be a culturally influenced variable, with PIC subjects using significantly longer pauses than either NPIC or Anglo subjects. On the average, PIC subjects paused five seconds, twice as long as Anglo subjects did, before beginning a response to an interview question. These results correspond with Basso's (1979) and S. Phillips' (1983) research which emphasized the acceptance of extended pauses in Native American cultures to allow serious consideration of a question. In the Warm Springs tribe (Phillips, S. 1983), questions are frequently answered some time after they have been asked with little apparent syntactical linking. Basso points out the Apache tendency to speak at a deliberate and measured pace and to avoid using the fast, tense speech of Anglos.

Further support for the argument that latency of response is a culturally influenced variable is found in the results of the Pearson's correlation test which was performed across subject groups to measure the relationship between this variable and IRS scores. A significant negative relationship was found ($r = -.36$, $p < .01$). When this test was performed within each subject group, only the PIC group scores resulted in a significant relationship between

these variables ($r = -.58$, $p < .004$), suggesting that the homogenic quality of PIC subjects' use of extended pauses overwhelmed the heterogenic quality of the NPIC and ANGLO subjects' pauses.

The importance of this variable in determining interview outcome is supported by Hollandsworth, et. al's (1979) study which established fluency of speech, with the exception of appropriate content, as the most important variable of the seven variables which were considered in their research on interview decisions. Fluency of speech was defined as the ability to speak spontaneously, use words well, and articulate thoughts clearly.

4. Judges perceive Anglo subjects to communicate more competently in the selection interview than do Native American subjects, even though few quantified differences in nonverbal and verbal content were detected. These results suggest that a.) qualitative differences in interviewee communication behaviors may exist which were not detected by this research study's methodologies and/or b.) other variables may adversely affect interview ratings of Native American subjects.

As mentioned earlier, no significant differences were found between subject groups in the quantity of their responses to interview questions nor in the amount of nonverbal behavior they exhibited, with the exception of latency of response. An analysis of the judges' ratings of subject interview behaviors, however, revealed that Anglo subjects were rated significantly higher than either PIC or NPIC subjects. These results suggest that qualitative differences may exist in interviewee communication behaviors which this research did not detect.

a.) Qualitative differences in interviewee communication behaviors may exist which was not detected by this research study's methodologies

If the premise is accepted that the selection interview is a persuasive communication situation, then the valence of responses, as well as the specificity and quantity of responses, may need to be considered. No significant differences were found between the ratings of Native American subjects and Anglo subjects on IRS items which related to their ability to describe their previous work, extracurricular, or other experiences in order to support their abilities as employees, nor did the quantity of specific, general, and irrelevant responses given by NPIC and PIC groups vary significantly from the Anglo

group's. However, interviewers rated both PIC and NPIC subjects significantly lower than Anglo subjects on Interview Rating Scale (IRS) items which referred to the quality of the content of responses.

Interviewers rated both NPIC and PIC subjects significantly lower than Anglo subjects on the two items relating to content which imply the need to persuade: "emphasizes the positive rather than the negative", and "responds appropriately to negatives such as 'too young', 'not experienced enough', etc." PIC subjects were also rated lower than Anglos on the item which rated the subject's "verbalization of an interest in working and in the job s/he is applying for".

The methodology employed in this research quantified interviewee responses by treating verb clauses as discrete statements and recording the number of positive or neutral verb clauses used to respond to interview questions. No attempt was made to rate the degree of positiveness or neutralness of responses. Existing research indicates that in many tribes, calling attention to one's self by competing or thrusting oneself into the limelight, as one would need to do to "sell" oneself in an interview situation, is considered immature, inappropriate, or disharmonious (Basso, 1979; Lujan and Dobkins, 1978). One of the conclusions of this research study is that

culturally-related norms may affect the qualitative level of responses, and that these responses may hamper performance in the majority culture selection interview (MCSI). Another example of this occurrence is found in the examination of nonverbal communication variables.

Eye contact was one of the six nonverbal communication variables quantified but not qualitatively analyzed by this research. Questions centering on the importance of eye contact in the interview have been the subject of considerable research (Hollandsworth, 1979; Imada and Hakel, 1977; McGovern and Tinsley, 1978). Research done among Native American cultures suggests that Native Americans have a much lower level of eye contact than do Anglo Americans (Phillips, 1983; Basso, 1979; Christopherson and Dingle, 1979). Their findings however, are not supported by the results of this study. The mean amount of eye contact observed in the PIC, NPIC, and ANGLO groups was almost identical, with subjects in the PIC group using eye-contact 46% of the time, NPIC subjects 48%, and Anglo subjects 51%.

These results, however, do not correspond to the interviewers' ratings of subject eye contact in the interview. An analysis of personnel interviewers' scoring of the IRS item, "Maintains an appropriate amount of eye contact" established a significant difference between the

PIC subject group's scores on this item and the Anglo group's scores ($p < .05$) with PIC subjects being rated significantly lower than Anglos. No significant differences were found in the NPIC and Anglo groups nor between PIC and NPIC subjects on this variable. These results suggest that it may be on the quality, not the quantity, of eye contact that the judges based their ratings.

Post-evaluation discussions with the judges resulted in several possible explanations for this phenomenon. One judge suggested that he felt the Indian subjects seemed less comfortable with using eye contact, frequently breaking eye contact and suddenly reestablishing it, "as if s/he remembered he was supposed to be looking at me...". Another judge suggested that he was responding to the direction the applicant looked when not in eye contact, and that he remembered the Indian applicants as looking down more often than the Anglo applicants.

These perceptions are similar to the research findings of Tankard (1970) who investigated hiring decisions by using photographs of subjects looking straight ahead, looking sideways, and looking downward. The photos were rated by undergraduate students who were instructed to assume s/he was interviewing the applicant for a position. Results of this study suggested that the stimulus persons

were rated more favorably when they looked straight ahead than when they looked downward. Similar results were found by Amalfitano and Kalt (1977) when they had employment interviewers rate stimulus photographs of 'applicants' who were either looking down or directly at the camera. Applicants who were looking at the camera were perceived as more alert, assertive, dependable, confident, responsible and having more initiative when the 'applicant' looked directly at the camera.

If Downs (1969) and Drake (1977) are correct in their assumptions that employers want to hire confident, aggressive applicants, then the type of eye contact exhibited by the Native American applicants who have lived in predominantly Indian communities may handicap them in the interview situation. Since the quality of the eye contact was not considered within this research, future research may offer more insight into this possibility.

Because of this discrepancy in findings, additional research is needed to determine what qualitative differences exist and their relationship to interview outcomes. If the selection interview is a persuasive communication situation, then the valence of responses, as well as the specificity and quantity of communication, should be considered.

b.) Other variables may adversely affect interview ratings of Native American subjects.

Consideration of interviewer ratings of PIC and NPIC subjects on particular IRS items which do not appear to correlate with other quantitative measures of these variables (eye contact, specificity of response) suggest several variables which were not explored may adversely affect the ratings of Native American subjects in the selection interview. An investigation of rate, volume, pitch, and accentedness of speech, as well as total utterances and words spoken, may offer substantial understanding of the communication behaviors which influence interview outcomes.

One support for the future consideration of a "total words spoken" variable is the interviewer rating of subjects on the "Speaks appropriate amount" IRS item. Results of interviewer rating of subjects indicate that while subject groups did not vary significantly in the number of specific, general, or irrelevant or negative clauses they used in the interview, PIC subjects were rated significantly lower on the IRS scale item, "Speaks appropriate amount."

Both PIC and NPIC subjects were rated significantly lower than Anglo subjects on two items relating to the volume and rate of speech. Both were rated lower on the

items, "Speaks clearly and audibly" and "Speaks fluently, no excessive hesitation" ($p < .05$). As mentioned earlier, many Native American tribes characteristically speak in a low, softly modulated voice, and speech is delivered at a deliberate, measured pace (Basso, 1979). As S. Phillips (1983) pointed out, Native Americans consider a quiet voice to be a sign of self-control and self-confidence. Since the volume of Native American applicants speech may also be culturally related, the difference in the rating of Native American subjects' speech and Anglo subject's speech may result from the judge's perception of appropriate volume in the interview situation. This perception may be different from the volume of speech necessary to be heard. If this is discovered to be the case, then such results would further support the majority culture view that volume of voice can be used as a persuasive tool to convince an interviewer of self-confidence and aggressiveness, two behaviors previously determined by researchers to positively influence interview outcomes.

Consideration of the accentedness of speech of interview subjects may identify another variable which affects the interview outcome of Native American subjects. While this research did not attempt to rate subject's clarity of speech, the differences in the rating of Native American and Anglo subject performance on volume and

clarity suggest that cultural differences may account for the lower rating of Indian subjects. Eighty-two percent of the Haskell student population know their tribal language as well as English, and among the Navajo and Apache populations, most have learned English as a second language (Yumitani, 1986). It is possible that the interviewer's lack of familiarity with the Native American subject's speech patterns, such as accentedness, inflections, and rhythm, may affect their ability to understand the PIC and NPIC subject's speech. This lack of familiarity may lead the judge to perceive the subject's speech as unclear. Support for this possibility exists in the research done by De La Zerda (1978) which found that interviewer ratings of Mexican American subjects varied inversely with the amount of accentedness of the subjects' speech, with high levels of accentedness corresponding to lower levels of job placement even when the applicant's qualifications were held constant.

5. Native American subjects from primarily Indian communities demonstrate less intercultural communication adaption in the majority culture interview situation than do either the Native American subjects from Anglo communities or Anglo subjects. This level of adaption appears to be related to a lack of experience and/or skill

in the intercultural communication situation rather than to a lack of motivation to communicate or a lack of knowledge of the interview situation.

Native American subjects from primarily Indian communities (PIC) used significantly longer pauses before responding to interviewer questions than did either the NPIC or Anglo subjects. In addition to this observable quantified difference in behaviors, an analysis of the judges' ratings of PIC subjects' performance on individual items of the IRS scale revealed 10 items on which PIC subjects were rated lower than Anglo subjects. NPIC subjects, subjects not from primarily Indian communities, were rated lower than Anglo subjects on only five of the fifteen items.

The lower rating of PIC subject performance and the difference in response time suggests that the PIC subjects adapt less well to majority culture communication norms than do their NPIC counterparts. This performance does not appear to be related to motivation to communication or to knowledge of appropriate communication behaviors in the MCSI, since no significant differences between PIC and Anglo subjects were discovered on these measures.

One explanation for the lower level of adaption is the probable lack of experience of PIC subjects, and hence the lack of opportunity to develop skills in intercultural communication. If communication competence is comprised of knowledge, motivation, and skill, then it would appear that education of both subjects and interviewers in the communication norms of the society in which they choose to participate would be beneficial. Possible approaches to such educational programs are included later in this chapter.

The concept of stereotyping offers another possible explanation for the judge's lower ratings of Native American performance. Since this study did not include a measure of any existing stereotypes which the judges may have possessed concerning Native Americans, this possibility cannot be supported as a conclusion. However, the discrepancies which existed between the actual amount of eye contact used by Native American subjects and the judges' ratings of the amount utilized suggests that the such stereotyping may have occurred. If this is the case, stereotyping of other nonverbal behaviors may also have influenced the judges' ratings of other nonverbal and verbal behaviors.

6. The lack of demonstrable intercultural adaption to majority culture communication norms may also negatively impact the opportunities of Native Americans in areas other than the interview situation.

Ellingsworth's (1983) theory of adaptive intercultural communication suggests that mutual adaptation of communication style is necessary in intercultural situations, but when equity between communicators is not present, the burden of adaptation falls on the less advantaged. The burden of adaptation falls on the applicant in most interview situations, and on most minorities in this country's culture. While the United States may be considered a "melting pot" of many nationalities, the Anglo culture is still predominant. While racial and cultural discrimination is illegal, our laws cannot dictate attitudes. Opportunities for advancement in employment situations frequently appear to go to those whose behaviors demonstrate adaption to the organization's communication norms, with those who do not adapt, regardless of cause, often being passed over.

In educational institutions, particularly at the secondary and postsecondary levels, intercultural adaption seems to correlate with success. The ability to understand and adapt to the communication norms of that environment

can significantly influence success. Upward Bound programs already recognize this situation and attempt to increase minority students' success rates by orienting them to majority culture values. Similar programs which would help Native American students adapt to majority culture institutions already exist in several colleges in the Southwest and have met with success by providing both orientation and support to Native American college students.

Limitations of this Study

One of the foundations of good research is the review of the research process after the results have been formulated. This critical examination has resulted in the identification of several limitations to this study. Perhaps the greatest limitation is the lack of reality or urgency that may exist when an individual participates in an interview which may result in immediate employment. This lack of authenticity may influence the motivation of both the interviewee and the interviewer. A situation which could provide the cultural diversity necessary in this study and provide for the videotaping of "real" selection interviews would be ideal. However, the lack of consistency that such a situation might create, such as a

wide range of interviewers, different interviewing styles, a greater range of position sophistication, may create a separate set of limitations.

Ideally, an equivalent junior college situation from which to draw Anglo subjects might also provide a more realistic match of subject groups in terms of educational and possibly, economic backgrounds. The difficulty with this matching would be to locate a junior college which draws Anglo students from a variety of geographical and cultural areas since Haskell is populated by students from 32 states and over 100 different tribal communities. While the selection of a major university as a source of Anglo subjects may sacrifice commonalities in educational backgrounds, it does provide a greater variety of geographical and cultural backgrounds than would a community junior college. Also, the location of both the University of Kansas and Haskell Indian Junior College in Lawrence, Kansas, provides for a common college community setting.

The possibility that subject groups may have possessed differing amounts of interview training and/or experience must also be considered as a possible limitation in this study. The inclusion of questions concerning these experiences would be a positive addition to future research utilizing this study's methodology.

Videotaping interviews creates another limitation for this study. The possible effect of videotaping on subject and interviewer performance was not measured. It is possible that subjects who are accustomed to videotaping may respond differently to the situation than will subjects who have never been videotaped. A certain amount of spontaneity and comfort in the interviewer may also be sacrificed by the videotaping and by following a structured interview format designed to provide consistency across subjects. However, the ability to review the interviews for coding and judging reliability somewhat offsets this limitation.

Another limitation to this study is the quantity of the independent variables which this research considered in relationship to selection interview decisions. Because of the extensive number of variables which were examined in this study, many of the communication variables were quantified to provide a general description of subject behaviors, but the quality of each of these variables was not determined. Based on the results of this research, less attention may be given in the future to the quantification of variables which seem to bear little relationship to performance. Instead, more in-depth

consideration could be given to a select number of behaviors which seem to exhibit the strongest relationship to hiring decisions.

The final limitation of this study deals with the question of generalizability. As mentioned earlier, the definition of "one" Native American culture is impossible due to the many standards which exist within and without Native American communities. These findings must be considered as indicators of observed behaviors of a relatively small and select (college students) portion of the Native American community. Given the dearth of existing literature with this community, however, it does provide a place to begin expanding the bank of knowledge about the intricacies of cross-cultural communication in the selection interview situation.

Implications for Future Research

This research has attempted to answer several broad based questions about Native American and Anglo subjects' communication behaviors in the selection interview, the results suggest a number of other questions which need to be examined. As mentioned earlier, this research attempted to quantify a number of communication aspects in the interview situation, but did not attempt to provide a qualitative definition of many of these behaviors. Further

examination of the relationship of the quality of eye contact, the fluency of speech, or the degree of positiveness of responses in the interview situation may provide more insight into the selection process and its intercultural impact. Research which examines the interviewers' preconceived perceptions of the communication strengths and weaknesses of Native American applicants may also provide a greater understanding of the rating of these applicants.

As descriptive research provides more information about Native American communication behaviors in the selection interview, research which attempts to identify the most effective way of teaching interviewing skills to this and other culturally diverse population should be formulated.

The answers provided and questions raised by this research may provide a basis for research with similar cultural groups in the United States. There appears to be many similarities between Native Americans and recent South Asian immigrants to the United States. Both groups have been forcibly removed from their land. Some have attempted to maintain traditional values by living in self-imposed isolation with other South Asians and working in South Asian controlled businesses. Others have chosen to

assimilate into the Anglo culture, living and working in Anglo-controlled environments. Some try to maintain cultural sovereignty while living in Anglo communities.

The physical similarities of these populations to Native Americans in colorations and size, along with cultural similarities in voice volume and bi-lingual language skills, may also elicit interviewer reactions similar to those of Native American subjects. Research with these populations, who are rapidly becoming a significant minority in the United States, may also lead to the applications suggested in this research for increased interviewer and interviewee awareness of the impact of cross-cultural communication in the interview.

Possible Applications of this Research

If the limitations of this research are respected, information from this study may be utilized in training programs designed for Native American participants. While this research indicates that these applicants understand the utility of describing their abilities and experiences in job-related situations, their interview performance may be enhanced by volunteering more positive information about themselves, delineating not only those things of which they are capable, but their degree of skill in these areas. Practice in the identification of specific job-related

attributes and developing the verbal skills to emphasize the most positive aspects of these in a concrete manner may also decrease the length of time it takes the applicant to formulate the answer.

The process of teaching selection interviewing skills that also incorporates the culture norms of the majority culture creates a unique challenge for educators who attempt it. Educators must be able to acknowledge the legitimacy of the Native American cultures while providing students with a frame of reference for interviewing in the Anglo world. If educators can help students view the acquisition of these interviewing behaviors as simply another tool to achieve specified goals, rather than as a rejection of their own values, the most difficult part of their job will have been accomplished.

Another equally important application for these research results will be to educate personnel interviewers to recognize the existence of legitimate cultural differences and to reframe, when necessary, their perceptions of what constitutes self-assurance, confidence, and maturity. In doing so, the interviewers may avoid making judgements based on differences which may not affect the applicant's performance in the work place.

Summary of Conclusions

In summary, six general conclusions may be drawn from the findings discussed in this chapter. 1) Of all the variables considered in this research to influence interviewer decisions, the quantity of the applicant's specific, positive responses in the interview situation correlates most strongly with the interviewer's rating of that applicant, both within and across subject groups. 2) There is a significant and inverse relationship between the length of time the applicant takes to begin responding to an interviewer's question and the judge's rating of that applicant. This result suggests two possibilities: (a) a longer response time is perceived negatively, perhaps being considered indicative of a lack of confidence or aggressiveness, rather than as a positive indication of maturity, thoughtfulness, and/or self-control, and (b) because this is the only variable considered which correlated significantly across subjects but only within the PIC subject group, this behavior, more than any of the other behaviors considered, may be culturally based. 3) Native American subjects who have lived in primarily Anglo communities are perceived to perform better in the selection interview than subjects who have lived in predominantly Native American communities, though both groups are rated significantly lower in their communication

behaviors in the selection interview situation than are their Anglo counterparts. 4) The results of this research suggest that nonverbal communication behaviors, as well as verbal ones, have a qualitative, as well as a quantitative value, and both need to be considered in research relating to interview outcomes. 5) Native Americans from predominantly Indian communities adapt less well to majority culture communication norms than do Native American subjects from Anglo communities. This lack of adaption appears to be related more to a lack of experience in intercultural communication rather than a lack of motivation to communicate or a lack of knowledge of majority culture norms. Finally, Native American subjects who do not demonstrate competence in majority culture communication norms may also experience difficulty in communication situations other than those presented by the selection interview situation.

-End-

APPENDIX A
CONSENT FORM

The Department of Communication Studies supports the practice of protection for human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in the present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate you are free to withdraw at any time.

The study is concerning the behavior of college students in the selection interview. You will be asked to complete questionnaires which describe your feelings about various communication situations and your knowledge of the interview, and to participate in a simulated employment interview with an interviewer. The interview will be videotaped and later viewed by researchers who will rate and describe the communication behaviors exhibited in the interview. The findings of this research could have an application to speech-related courses on a college level.

Your participation is solicited, but strictly voluntary. Do not hesitate to ask any questions about the study. Be assured that the names of the students will not be associated in any way with the research findings. We appreciate your cooperation very much.

Sincerely,

Gail C. Sloan
Principal Investigator
Phone number: 749-8476

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, R.R. & Brown, K.L. (1987). DEVELOPING COMMUNICATION COMPETENCE IN CHILDREN. Skokie: National Textbook.
- Amalfitano, J.C. & Kalt, N.C. (1977). Effects of eye contact on the evaluation of job applicants. JOURNAL OF EMPLOYMENT COUNSELING, 14, 46-48.
- Arygle, M. (1987). Cultural differences in bodily communication. BODILY COMMUNICATION, in process of publication.
- Argyris, C. (1965). Explorations in interpersonal competence. JOURNAL OF APPLIED BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE, 58-63.
- Arvey, R.D. & Campion, J.E. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, 35, 281-323.
- Asuncion-Lande, N.C. & Pascasio, E.M. (1981). BUILDING BRIDGES ACROSS CULTURES. Manila, Philippines: Solidaridad Publishing.
- Backlund, P., Barbour, A., Larson, C. & Redmond, M. (1978). ASSESSING FUNCTIONAL COMMUNICATION, ERIC: March.
- Barnland, D. (1975). Communication in a global village. PUBLIC & PRIVATE SELF IN JAPAN & THE UNITED STATES, Tokyo: Simul Press.
- Basso, K. (1979). PORTRAITS OF "THE WHITEMAN". New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Berleson, B. (1952). CONTENT ANALYSIS IN COMMUNICATION RESEARCH. Glencoe Ill: Free Press.
- Bolster, B.I. & Springbett, B.M. (1961). The reaction of interviewers to favorable and unfavorable information. JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, 45, 97-103.
- Chan, M.B. & McCroskey, J.C. (1987). The WTC scale as a predictor of classroom participation. COMMUNICATION RESEARCH REPORTS, 4, 2, Dec.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). ASPECTS OF A THEORY OF SYNTAX. Cambridge Mass: MIT Press.

- Christopherson, V.A. & Dingle, S.F. (1979). Rural navajo youth: A challenge for resource development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society.
- Cohen, B.M. & Etheridge, J.M. (1975). Recruiting's main ingredient. JOURNAL OF COLLEGE PLACEMENT. Winter, 75-77.
- De La Zerda, N.J. (1977). Employment Interviewers' Reactions to Mexican American Speech (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin). DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS INTERNATIONAL, 1978, 38, 3800A.
- Downs, C.W. (1969). Perceptions of the selection interview. PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATOR, May-June, 8-23.
- Downs, C.W., Smeyak, G.P., & Martin, E. (1980). PROFESSIONAL INTERVIEWING. New York: Harper & Row.
- Downs, C.W., Johnson, K., & Barge, K. (1986). unpublished research.
- Drake, L.R., Kaplan, H.R., & Stone, R.A. (1972). How do employers value the interview? JOURNAL OF COLLEGE PLACEMENT, 1972, 32, (3), 47-51.
- Duran, R.L. & Wheelless, V.E. (1980). Social managment: Toward a theory based operationalization of communication competence. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Conference, New York.
- Eihorn, L.J. (1981). An inner view of the job interview: An investigation of successful communicative behaviors. COMMUNICATION EDUCATION, July, 30, (3), 217-228.
- Ekman, P. & Friesen, W. (1976). UNMASKING THE FACE. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Ellingsworth, H. (1983) Adaptive interculture communication. in INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION, THEORY, CURRENT PERSPECTIVES, 7, Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing Inc.
- Forsdale, L. (1981). PERSPECTIVES ON COMMUNICATION. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Galassi, J.P. & Galassi, M.D. (1978). Preparing individuals for job interviews: Suggestions From More than 60 years of research. PERSONNEL & GUIDANCE JOURNAL, December, 188-192.

- Gardner, K.F. (1967). EDUCATION AND SOCIAL CRISIS. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Geboe, C. (1987). Profile of Haskell Students. Presented at Haskell Faculty Meeting, Fall Semester.
- Goodall, D.B. & Goodall, H.L. (1982). The employment interview: A selective review of the literature with implications for communications research. COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY, 30, (2), 116-123.
- Gudykunst, W.B. (1983) INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION, THEORY, CURRENT PERSPECTIVES, 7, Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing Inc.
- Haskell Indian Junior College (1984) Report for North Central Accreditation Committee.
- Haskell Indian Junior College (1987). [New Student Survey]. Unpublished raw data.
- Heaps, R.A. & Morrill, S.G. (1979). Comparing the self-concepts of navajo and white high school students. JOURNAL OF AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION, 18, 12-14.
- Hollandworth, J.G., Kazelskis, R., Stevens, J. & Dressel, M.E. (1979). Relative contributions of verbal, articulative, and nonverbal communication to employment decisions in the job interview setting. PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY, 32, 359-367.
- Hollmann, T.D. (1972). Employment interviewers' errors in processing positive and negative information. JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, 56, 130-134.
- Hopper, R. (1977). Language attitudes in the employment interview. COMMUNICATION MONOGRAPHS, 44, 346-351.
- Hymes, D.H. (1971). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (eds.) SOCIOLINGUISTICS. Middlesex, England: Penguin.
- Imada, A.S. and Hakel, M.D. (1977). Influence of nonverbal communication and rater proximity on impressions and decisions in simulated employment interviews. JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, 62 (3), 295-300.
- Jablin, F.M. & McComb, K.B. (1983, May). The employment screening interview: A review and reexamination of the process from a communication and organizational assimilation perspective. Paper presented at the

annual convention of the International Communication Association, Organizational Communication Division, Dallas, Texas.

- Jauquet, A.M. & Parlin, B.W. (1988). A typical recruiter. JOURNAL OF COLLEGE PLACEMENT, 37 (4), 33-35.
- Kalin, R. & Rayko, D.S. (1978). Discrimination in evaluative judgments against foreign accented job candidates. PSYCHOLOGY REPORTS, 43, 1203-1209.
- Keenan, A. & Wedderburn, A.A. (1975). Effects of the non-verbal behavior of interviewers on candidates' impressions. JOURNAL OF OCCUPATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, 48, 129-132.
- Kerlinger, F.N. (1973). FOUNDATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH (2nd ed.) Chicago: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Krieshok, T.S. (1983). A review of research trends in the selection interview. Unpublished paper (University of Kansas).
- Larson, C.E., Baclund, P.M., Redmond, M.K. & Barbour, A. (1978). ASSESSING COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE. Falls Church, Va.: Speech Communication Association.
- Lujan, P.D., & Dobkins, D. (1978). Communicative reticence: Native americans in the college classroom. Paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1982). Communication competence and performance: A research and pedagogical perspective. COMMUNICATION EDUCATION, 31, 1-7.
- McCroskey, J.C. & Baer, J.E. (1985, November). Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measure. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association, Denver, Colorado.
- McCroskey, J.C. & McCroskey, L.L. (1986, February). Correlates of willingness to communicate. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association, Tuscon, Arizona.

- McCroskey, J.C. & McCroskey, L.L. (1986, May).
Predictors of willingness to communicate:
Implications for screening and remediation. Paper
presented at the International Communication
Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- McCroskey, J.C. & McCroskey, L.L. (1986, November).
Communication competence and willingness to
communicate. Paper presented at the Speech
Communication Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- McCroskey, J.C. & Richmond, V.P. (1986, March).
Willingness to communicate and interpersonal
communication. Paper presented at the West Virginia
Symposium on Personality and Interpersonal
Communication, Morgantown, W. Virginia.
- McCroskey, J.C., Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, L.L. (1987,
May). Correlates of self-perceived communication
competence. Paper presented at the annual convention
of the International communication Association,
Montreal, Canada.
- McGovern, T.V., Jones, B.W. & Morris, S.E. (1978).
Interviewer evaluations of interviewee nonverbal
behavior. JOURNAL OF COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY, 26,
176-179.
- McGovern, T.V., & Tinsley, H.E. (1978). Interviewer
evaluation of interviewee nonverbal behavior. JOURNAL
OF VOCATIONAL BEHAVIOR, 13, 163-171.
- Mehrabian, A. (1972). NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION. Chicago:
Aldine-Atherton.
- Moffat, T. (1979). SELECTION INTERVIEWING FOR MANAGERS.
New York: Harper and Row.
- Mullings, T.W. (1978). RACIAL ATTITUDES AND THE
SELECTION INTERVIEW: A FACTORAL EXPERIEMENT.
Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of
Houston.
- Ott, L. (1977). AN INTRODUCTION TO STATISTICAL METHODS
AND DATA ANALYSIS. North Scituate, Mass: Duxbury
Press.
- Pearson, J.C. & Nelson, P.E. (1982). UNDERSTANDING &
SHARING: AN INTRODUCTION TO SPEECH COMMUNICATION.
Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown.

- Perotti, V.S. & DeWine, S. (1987). Competence in communication: An examination of three instruments. *MANAGEMENT COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY*, 1, 2, 272-287.
- Phillips, G.M. (1983). A competent view of competence. *COMMUNICATION EDUCATION*, 32, 23-36.
- Phillips, S.U. (1983). *THE INVISIBLE CULTURE*. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Posner, B.Z. (1981). Comparing recruiter, student, and faculty perceptions of important applicant and job characteristics. *PERSONNEL PSYCHOLOGY*, 34, 329-339.
- Prazak, J. (1969). Learning job seeking interview skills. In J.D. Krumboltz & C.E. Thoresen (Eds.), *BEHAVIORAL COUNSELING: CASES AND TECHNIQUES*. Dallas: Holt, Rinehardt & Winston.
- Raffler-Engel, W. (1983). *THE PERCEPTION OF NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR IN THE CAREER INTERVIEW*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rand, T.M. & Wexley, K.N. (1975). Demonstration of the effect "similar to me" in simulated employment interviews. *PSYCHOLOGICAL REPORTS*, 36, 535-544.
- Rasmussen, K.G. (1984). Nonverbal behavior, verbal behavior, resume credentials, and selection interview outcomes. *JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY*, 69, 4, 551-556.
- Robertson, J. (1978). *HOW TO WIN IN A JOB INTERVIEW*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Ruben, B.D. (1976). Assessing communication competency for intercultural adaption. *GROUP AND ORGANIZATIONAL STUDIES*, September, 334-354.
- Rubin, R.B. (1983, November). Conceptualizing communication competence: Directions for research and instruction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, D.C.
- Samover, L.A. & Porter, R.E. (1985) *INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION: A READER*. Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth.
- Samover, L.A., Porter, R.E., & Jain, N.C. (1981). *UNDERSTANDING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.

- Scherer, K.R. & Ekman, P. (1982). HANDBOOK OF METHODS IN NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR RESEARCH. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Snodgrass, G. & Wheeler, R.W. (1983). A research-based sequential job training model. JOURNAL OF COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL, September, 449-454.
- Speas, C.M. (1978). A comparison of the effectiveness of model exposure, role playing, model exposure and role playing with videotape feedback, and No treatment for training prison inmates job-seeking interview skills. Unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).
- Spitzberg, B.H. (1983). Communication competence as knowledge, skill, and impression. COMMUNICATION EDUCATION, 32, 323-329.
- Tanner, J. (1980). A study of decision-making in the selection interview. Unpublished thesis (University of Kansas).
- Tengler, C.D. & Jablin, F.M. (1986). Effects of question type, orientation, and sequencing in the employment screening interview. Unpublished paper (University of Texas).
- Tschirgi, H.D. (1972-73). What do recruiters really look for in candidates? JOURNAL OF COLLEGE PLACEMENT, 33, 75-79.
- Turchen, M. (1984). The native american experience at Dakota University. EDRS.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. (1980). 1980 CENSUS OF POPULATION. Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population, Chap. B, General Population Characteristics, United States Summary.
- Venardos, M.G., & Harris, M.B. (1973). Job interview training with rehabilitation clients: A comparison of videotape and role-playing procedures. JOURNAL OF APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY, 58, 365-367.
- Wax, R.H. & Thomas R.K. (1961). American indians and white people. PYLON, 22, 305-317.
- Webster, E. (1982). THE EMPLOYMENT INTERVIEW. Ontario: S.I.P. Publications.

- Weimann, J.M. & Backlund, P. (1980). Current theory and research in communicative competence. REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, 50, 185-199.
- Young, D.M. (1977). Nonverbal communication in the employment interview: creating the climate to hire. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1976). DISSERTATION ABSTARACTS INTERNATIONAL, 37, 3639B.
- Young, D.M. & Beier, E.G. (1977). The role of applicant nonverbal communication in the employment interview. JOURNAL OF EMPLOYMENT COUNSELING, 14, 154-156.
- Yumitani, Y. (1986). A sociolinguistic survey of native american students at Haskell Indian Jr. College. Unpublished thesis, (University of Kansas).
- Zakahi, W.R. & McCroskey, J.C. (1986, Nov). Willingness to communicate: A confounding variable in communication research. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Chicago, Il.